TABLE

U.C. 4 OF VARR

529.3
Gre

EDWARD GR

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRIS E,

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOLUME III.

00059205

OXFORD:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
M.DCCC.LIV.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

00059205

ORIGINES KALENDARIÆ ITALICÆ.

ON THE CALENDARS OF ANCIENT ITALY.

DISSERTATION XII.

On the Verification of the Roman Calendar by the testimony of Eclipses.

LIBRA OF TH BOMB BRANC OF TH ROYAL ASIATIC

CH[redacted]

SECTION I.—*Of the Eclipses [redacted] Roman history.*

THE number of eclipses which to ha[redacted]pon record in Roman history at present is smal[redacted] questio[redacted]re is reason to believe that not only every phenom[redacted]cle vi[redacted] that [redacted] even the most casual affections of the air and the heavens were [redacted] fully entered in the journals kept by the pontiffs, and c[redacted] the Annales Maximi[1]. Still there are as many as may suffice to test and confirm the truth of our Roman calendar from first to last, so long as it stands in need of any such confirmation. And forasmuch as a criterion and proof of this kind will be allowed upon all hands to be one of the most critical and convincing to which we could possibly appeal; though each of these eclipses has been already noticed, or will have to be so hereafter, in its proper order of time, we think it advisable to bring them together; in order that their cu-

[1] Diss. ch. ii. sect. ii. Vol. i. p. 28.

mulative force and amount may be the better seen and appreciated.

It is necessary however to premise to this review that in some cases the Roman date of the eclipse has been assigned, along with the fact of it, in terms of the calendar for the time being; and this can be compared at once with the Julian date of the same natural phenomenon, at the same point of time, as either obtained by calculation for ourselves, or taken from the Tables of eclipses already calculated. In such cases the confirmation of our calendar by this species of testimony is complete. The Julian date thus obtained by calculation or taken from the Tables, and the Roman date assigned by our calendar in terms of the Julian calendar, are always the same.

In other cases, the fact of an eclipse has been mentioned in its proper order of time, but without its Roman date for the time being. In such instances, the phenomenon is known; and generally perhaps the time of the year: but the actual day is a desideratum. We propose to include these also in our review. They are useful in a secondary degree as confirming the arrangements and details of the Roman Fasti; and no confirmation by means of testimony as this ought to be omitted.

Lastly there are instances also on record of phenomena which, though specified as ecliptic in the history of the time, appear to be referrible to the class of eclipses; but whether of pseudo-eclipses or true must depend on the circumstances of the case. We propose briefly to notice these also. The survey which we are contemplating of this particular kind of testimony and corresponding kind of proof will extend from B. C. 750 down to B. C. 49 at least: and it might be continued from B. C. 49 to A. D. 186. But we reserve such cases of the same kind as come between B. C. 45 and A.D. 186 for the illustration and verification of the Julian Correction.

SECTION II.—*Eclipses, of which both the Roman and the Julian date are known.*

i. Solar Eclipse at the Foundation of Rome [m].

U. C. 4 Varr. U. C. 3 Cap. U. C. 1 Polyb. B. C. 750.

Nundinal calendar, Cycle i. 1. Martii 1 Feb. 4.

To illustrate the date of this eclipse both in the Nundinal calendar of the time, and in that of Numa, in which the proper date of the Foundation or of the Natales urbis was xi Kal. Maias, we will suppose Numa's calendar to have been in existence along with the Nundinal one of Romulus at the time of the Foundation itself, and its proper date to have been the Kalendæ Januariæ U. C. 1, February 4 B. C. 750.

Nundinal Calendar. Cycle i. 1.		Proleptic Calendar of Numa. Cycle i. 1.	
i Martius	Feb. 4 mid.	i Kalendæ Januariæ	Feb. 4 mid.
ii Aprilis	March 7 ..	ii .. Martiæ	March 5 ..
iii Maius	April 5 ..	iii .. Apriles	April 5 ..
Maii 20	April 24 [m]	xi Kalendas Maias	April 24

ii. Solar Eclipse at the death of Romulus [n].

U. C. 39 Varr. U. C. 38 Cap. U. C. 36 Polyb. B. C. 715.

Nundinal Calendar, Cycle viii. 1. [illegible] in question.

i Martius	January	20	mid.
ii Aprilis	February	20	..
iii Maius	March	21	..
iv Junius	April	21	..
v Quinctilis	May	20	..
7 Quinctilis, Nonæ Quinctiles	May 26 [n]		

iii. Solar Eclipse of the Nones of Junius U. C. 350 of the Annales Maximi [o].

U. C. 354 Varr. U. C. 353 Cap. U. C. 351 Polyb. B. C. 400

Tribuni Militares M. Furius Camillus
Cn. Cornelius Cossus iii
L. Valerius Potitus iv.

[m] Vol. i. pages 108. 112. sqq. 157. [n] Vol. i. p. 118. sqq. [o] Vol. i. p. 128.

Decemviral Calendar, Cycle iii. 1. 377 days.

Kalendæ.					
i	Januariæ	December	29	mid.	B. C. 401
ii	Februariæ	January	27	..	.. 400
iii	Interkalares	February	19	..	.. ..
iv	Martiæ	March	18	..	.. ..
v	Apriles	April	18	..	.. ..
vi	Maiæ	May	17	..	.. ..
vii	Juniæ	June	17	..	.. ..

Nonæ Juniæ June 21 [o] B. C. 400.

iv. Solar Eclipse on the day of the battle of Zama [p].

U. C. 552 Varr. U. C. 551 Cap. U. C. 549 Polyb. B. C. 203—202.

Ti. Claudius Nero
M. Servilius (Pulex) Geminus.

Irregular calendar, Cycle i. 7. 356 days.

Kalendæ			B.C.	Kalendæ.			B.C.
i Januariæ	Nov. 25	mid.	203	vi Juniæ	April 22	mid.	202
ii Februariæ	Dec. 24	..	..	vii Quinctiles	May 21	..	..
iii Martiæ	Jan. 21	..	202	viii Sextiles	June 21	..	..
iv Apriles	Feb. 21	..	..	viiii Septembres	July 20	..	..
v Maiæ	Mar. 22	..	..	x Octobres	Aug. 18	..	..

xi Kalendæ Novembres September 18 mid. B. C. 202
xii Kalendæ Decembres October 17 .. .. ..
iii Nonas [illegible]embres October 19 mid.

v. Solar Eclipse U. C. 564 v Idus Quinctiles.

Per eos dies, observes Livy of this year [q], quibus est profectus ad bellum consul Ludis Apollinaribus ante diem quintum Idus Quinctiles cœlo sereno interdiu obscurata lux est, quum luna sub orbem solis subisset. It is an important eclipse, in order to ascertain the exact relation of the calendar year at this time to the natural, and the amount of the irregularity which had been already generated in the former; though the regular administration of the calendar had been laid aside only eighteen years. The Kalends of January in this year of the city were falling on August 16 B. C. 191. The year before it they fell on August 4: and that was the

[o] Vol. i. page 130. [p] Vol. i. page 450. [q] xxxvii. 4. cf. xxxvi. 45 : xxxvii. 1.

greatest degree of deflection from their normal or rectified position in the calendar to which they ever attained. After U. C. 563 B. C. 192—191 they began to ascend upwards again: and they never fell back so low as August 4 or August 16, a second time, down to the date of the Julian Correction itself.

U. C. 564 Varr. U. C. 563 Cap. U. C. 561 Polyb. B. C. 191—190.

L. Cornelius Scipio (Asiaticus)
C. Lælius.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 19. 378 days.

		B. C.	Kalendæ.		B. C.
Kalendæ	Aug. 16 mid.	191	v Apriles	Dec. 5 mid.	191
i Januariæ	Sep. 14		vi Maiæ	Jan. 3 ..	190
ii Februariæ	Oct. 7		vii Juniæ	Feb. 3	
iii Interkalares	Nov. 4		viii Quinctiles	Mar. 4	
iv Martiæ	[illegible]				

[illegible]is Quinctiles March 14 B. C. 190

v Id[illegible]d March 14 7.30 A. M. Paris. B. C. 190.

Pingré, ☉ eclipse[illegible]

[illegible]pse before the battle of Pydna.

vi. Lunar Ecli[illegible]

Livy alone has preserv[illegible]d the Roman date of the eclipse Pydna: though the fact itself of which preceded the battle of [illegible] is very generally attested[r]. a lunar eclipse at that time to hav[illegible] sequuta est dies, edita Nocte, quam pridie Nonas Sept[illegible] in question) luna quum de- hora (secunda sc. noctis usque a[illegible] that the pe[illegible]. The date in fecisset[s]. After which, Postero die[t] day of the mont[illegible] Nonas the calendar for the time being wa[illegible] their stated date, Tro[illegible]bius Septembres, reckoned from midnigh[illegible]17 Roman, appea[illegible] makes this the date of the battle[u]; [illegible] principle, if his text is not in error, he has confounded iii Nonas with ii Nonas, or Pridie Nonas. Some of our authorities (for instance Cicero) would imply that Gallus' explanation of the physical cause of the phenomenon was given the next morning; not (as Livy and others represent) the evening preceding, and before the eclipse itself. But this is a circumstance of dis-

[r] Polybius, xxix. 6. § 8. Cicero, De Republica, i. Valerius Max. viii. xi. 1 De effectibus artium rariis. Pliny, H. N. ii. 9. Plutarch, Æmilius Paullus, xvii. Frontinus, De Strategematis, i. xii. 8. Justin, xxxiii. 1. § 7. Lydus, De Ostentis, 10. 284. l. 4.

[s] Livy, xliv. 37.

[t] Ibid. 37—42.

[u] iv. 4.

tinction between these different accounts which does not affect the date of the eclipse.

U. C. 586 Varr. U. C. 585 Cap. U. C. 583 Polyb. B. C. 169-168.

L. Aimilius Paullus ii
C. Licinius Crassus.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 17. 378 days.

Kalendæ.			B. C.	Kalendæ.			B. C.
i	Januariæ	Oct. 2 mid.	169	vi	Maiæ	Feb. 19 mid.	168
ii	Februariæ	31 ..	..	vii	Juniæ	Mar. 22 ..	..
iii	Interkalares	Nov. 23 ..	..	viii	Quinctiles	Apr. 25 ..	..
iv	Martiæ	Dec. 21 ..	..	ix	Sextiles	May 21 ..	..
v	Apriles	Jan. 21 ..	168	x	Septembres	June 19 ..	..

iii Nonas Septembres June 21 B. C. 168.

Pingré, ☽ eclipsed June 21 7.45 P. M. Paris B. C. 168.

SECTION III. —*Eclipses, the fact of which and the year are known, but not the Roman date of the time being.*

i. Solar eclipse U. C. 537 Feb. 11 B. C. 217.

U. C. 537 Varr. U. C. 536 Cap. U. C. 534 Polyb. B. C. 217.

Cn. Servius Geminus
C. Flaminius ii.

Decemviral Calendar, Cycle x. 16. 355 days.

Kalendæ Januariæ January 25 mid. B. C. 217.

xiii Kalendas Februarias Feb. 11 mid.

An eclipse of the sun is incidentally mentioned by Livy, in the enumeration of certain prodigies or portents, the news of which reached Rome at the beginning of this consular year: Augebant metum prodigia ex pluribus simul locis nuntiata. in Sicilia militibus aliquot spicula, in Sardinia autem in muro circumeunti vigilias equiti scipionem quem manu tenuerat, arsisse . . . *et solis orbem minui visum*[w].

[w] xxii. 1. Cf. Orosius, iv. 15. who repeats this, after Livy, of the year of Thrasimen; Nam et solis orbis minui visus.

This last allusion is clearly to a partial eclipse of the sun, which must have been observed this year, U. C. 537 Varr. B. C. 217. The ingress of the consular year indeed is mentioned by Livy before he notices this fact: Per idem tempus Cn. Servilius consul Romæ Idibus Martiis magistratum iniit[w]. But the Ides of March this year fell on April 5; and if this eclipse happened in the February preceding, it is very possible that the above report of its having been observed, somewhere at a distance from Rome, and in the winter time, might not reach Rome until after April 5.

There was only one solar eclipse, according to Pingré, B. C. 217; viz. on February 11: which he has determined to 2.30 P. M. for the meridian of Paris. We have calculated this ecliptic conjunction ourselves; and determined it to February 11, at 13 h. 58 m. from midnight for the meridian of Greenwich. The sun's mean distance from the ascending node at the time was 5 s. 23° 22′; so that there must have been a considerable eclipse on this occasion somewhere or other. And this being assumed accordingly as the eclipse intended by Livy in this instance, its date in the regular calendar of the time, though not specified by him, must have been xiii Kalendas Februarias U. C. 537 Varr. January 18 Roman.

And this too being supposed to have been the actual Roman date of the phenomenon in question, xiii Kalendas Februarias; it is very observable that the permanent attachment of the Saturnalia to one day of the month (the same which is ever after known as their stated date, the xiv Kalendas Januarias, December 17 Roman, appears to have ultimately arisen out of it. Postremo, observes Livy[x], Decembri jam mense ad ædem Saturni Romæ inmolatum est, lectisterniumque imperatum . . . ac per urbem Saturnalia diem ac noctem clamatum; populusque eum diem festum habere ac servare in perpetuum jussus. There can be no doubt that the December here alluded to was that of this same consular year; and that the procuration of the prodigies in question including that of the eclipse for some reason or other lasted until then. And thus much is implied even in the mode in which Livy speaks of this last act of the kind:

[w] xxii. 1. [x] Ibid.

Postremo, Decembri jam mense; Lastly, when it was now the month of December—though the business of the procuration itself had very possibly begun as early as the Roman March or April.

It is therefore a singular coincidence that the eclipse should have happened on the xiii Kalendas Februarias, the 18th of the first month in this year, and that this ceremony of the Lectisternium and the Saturnalia, among the other means and modes of procuring it, should have been fixed to the xiv Kalendas Januarias, the 17th of the last month in the same year. No one could say what connection so superstitious a people as the Romans might not have imagined between these two things. The coincidence at least is something remarkable; and was very probably not the effect of chance.

The temple of Saturn indeed had been dedicated in B. C. 496 U. C. 258 Varro, and probably on this same day too, December 17 Roman, that year[y]. But this testimony of Livy proves that the Saturnalia had not been permanently attached to the same day before this year B. C. 217 U. C. 537[z]. And this leads us to observe that, B. C. 217 being assumed as the actual date of this attachment, and the day on which the Saturnalia were actually celebrated this year to have been the xiv Kalendas Januarias, December 17 Roman, and thereby to have become their fixed and stated date ever after; there is a passage in Macrobius, which may possibly throw some light on these proceedings, and at this time

Novius enim probatissimus Atellanarum scriptor ait,

Olim exspectata veniunt septem Saturnalia.

Memmius quoque, qui post Novium et Pomponium diu jacentem artem Atellanarum suscitavit, Nostri, inquit, majores velut bene multa instituere, hoc optime; A frigore fecere summo dies septem Saturnalia[a].

This implies that the proper seat of this festival in the natural year was later than the winter solstice; and in the regular calendar it might fall as early as December 16, and as late as January 15: and in the rectified years of the cycle

[y] Nundinal Cycle, Vol. ii. 101. No iv. [z] Cf. Vol. i. 453.
[a] Saturnalia, i. x. 240.

its proper date was December 28. In this very year, U. C. 537 B. C. 217, it fell on January 1 B. C. 216. And as the mean winter solstice at the same time was falling on December 25, and the true on December 24, (about noon for the meridian of Rome,) it follows that between the first Saturnalia, celebrated on the stated day in question, and the mean winter solstice, there was just an interval of seven days.

It could not be the meaning of Memmius, in the passage quoted from him by Macrobius, that the Saturnalia were appointed at first to last seven days; for that would have been contrary to the matter of fact, and to the history of the institution itself[b]. It is much more probable that he intended to say that they were instituted at first seven days after the middle of winter: which would be literally true of this institution B. C. 217–216. Add to this that these first Saturnalia of December 17 Roman were preceded by a Lectisternium ad Ædem Saturni; and the rule of the Lectisternium from the first seems to have been to last seven days, and some seven days between two Nundinal days in sequence[c]. U. C. 537 B. C. 217 Dec. 8–Dec. 16 Roman was one complete Nundinal cycle. This Lectisternium might be celebrated December 9–15 both inclusive; beginning on the day after one Nundinal day and ending on the day before the next. And these seven days coming so near to the date of the first Saturnalia, Dec. 17, the same year, and being so closely connected with them, might give occasion to the tradition which certainly appears to have been handed down among the Romans, (as Macrobius' testimony proves[d],) that even the first Saturnalia lasted seven days.

---

ii. Solar eclipse July 26 B. C. 216.

U. C. 538 Varr. U. C. 537 Cap. U. C. 535 Polyb. B. C. 216.

C. Terentius Varro
L. Æmilius Paullus ii.

---

[b] Vol. i. p. 453. [c] Vol. ii. 113. [d] Loco cit.

Decemviral Calendar, Cycle x. 17. 377 days.

	Kalendæ.			B. C.		Kalendæ.			B. C.
i	Januariæ	Jan.	14	mid. 216	v	Apriles	May	4	[illegible]d. 216
ii	Februariæ	Feb.	12	.. ..	vi	Maiæ	June	2	.. ..
iii	Interkalares	Mar.	7	.. ..	vii	Juniæ	July	3	.. ..
iv	Martiæ	April	3	.. ..	vii	Kalendas Quinctiles July 26.			

Pingré, ☉ eclipsed July 26 8.45 P. M. Paris B. C. 216.

This was the year of Cannæ. Among other prodigies, supposed to have preceded and prognosticated that event, Silius Italicus mentions an eclipse of the sun.

> Quæsivit Calaber subducta luce repente
> Immersus tenebris et terram et litora Sipus;
> Obseditque frequens castrorum limina bubo:
> Nec densæ trepidis apium se involvere nubes
> Cessarunt aquilis: non unus crine corusco
> Regnorum eversor rubuit letale cometes [e].

Whatsoever may be thought of some of these prodigies, the first seems to be intended of something historical; of the fact of a sudden darkness, and greater than usual, observed at Sipus or Sipontum on the Sinus Urias, in the ancient Daunia, the site of which was near that of the modern Manfredonia in Italy [f]. For this is no doubt the locality intended; though called by its Greek name of Sipus, and not by its Latin one of Sipontum [g].

There were two solar eclipses, B. C. 216; one January 31 at 6.45 A. M. for the meridian of Paris according to Pingré. But that must have been much too early in the year to have been construed into a presage of the battle of Cannæ, fought in the month of September the same year, even if it had been visible for any part of Italy; which may be considered a doubtful point. The other, according to Pingré, was that of July 26, at 8.45 P. M. for the meridian of Paris: and that would seem to have been too late to be visible at Sipontum.

We may collect however from the language of the above allusion that, if the darkness in question was the effect of

[e] Punica, viii. 631.

[f] D'Anville, i. 177.

[g] Cf. Polybius, x. 1 § 8. Pomponius Mela, ii. 4. p. 54. Pliny, H. N. iii. 16. 673. Livy, viii. 24: xxxiv. 45: xxxix. 23. Cicero, xvi. De Lege Agraria, ii. 27, 71: Ad Att. x. 7. Dio, xlviii. 27: 28. Servius, ad Æn. xi. 247.

a solar eclipse at the time, or an accompaniment of one, it must have happened towards the end of the day; and that the sun in fact must have gone down eclipsed, and sunset itself have been followed by an almost instantaneous darkness. For this appears to have been what the description intended by the land and the shore of the sea's being suddenly lost from view in a prodigious cloud of darkness. The external phenomena of this eclipse consequently must have been much the same as those of the eclipse of May 26, B. C. 715, at the death of Romulus, and as those of the eclipse of June 21 B. C. 400; both which happened under very similar circumstances, towards the end of the day: and sunset at that time too was followed by almost immediate darkness.

We have thought it worth while to calculate this ecliptic conjunction from our own Tables: and we find that for the meridian of Sipontum, (supposed to be 1h. 4m. 2sec. east of that of Greenwich,) it happened July 26 at 21 h. 19 m. 28 sec. from midnight. And that may be assumed as about the middle of the eclipse. But the magnitude of this eclipse must have been something considerable; the mean distance of the sun from the ascending node being only about 5° 26′ or 27′, and the true only 3° 43′ or 44″. It would consequently last three or four hours. We find from calculation also that apparent sunset on the same day, for the latitude of Sipontum, would take place about 19h. 23m. meantime from midnight; 1h. 56 or 57 minutes before the middle of the eclipse. We may conclude then that the eclipse would be beginning at sunset; and that the sun would actually go down in a state of partial eclipse, and not improbably in the midst of a convulsion of the elements: which, combined with the effect of the eclipse, might make its disappearance be followed by almost instant darkness. It is manifest at least that, with an eclipse of such magnitude, beginning at sunset and attaining to its maximum about two hours afterwards, the ordinary duration of twilight on this evening must have been very much shortened.

The Roman date of this eclipse would be vii Kalendas Quinctiles: June 24 Roman. The battle of Cannæ was fought on the iv Nonas Sextiles [h], next after, September 2

[h] A. Gellius, v. 17. Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 16. 286.

B. C. 216. Consequently the eclipse preceded that battle only by 38 days; and it might well be enumerated among the other prodigies which appeared to have foreboded it.

iii. Solar eclipse of February 11 B. C. 198.

U. C. 556 Varr. U. C. 555 Cap. U. C. 553 Polyb. B. C. 199—198.

T. Quinctius Flamininus
Sextus Ailius Paitus Catus.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 11. 355 days.

	Kalendæ.		B. C.		Kalendæ.		B. C.
i	Januariæ	Oct. 17 mid.	199	iv	Apriles	Jan. 13 mid.	198
ii	Februariæ	Nov. 15 ..	..	v	Maiæ	Feb. 11 ..	..
iii	Martiæ	Dec. 13 ..	..				

Kalendæ Maiæ February 11 B. C. 198.

This consular year did not begin later than the Ides of March[i], Dec. 27 B. C. 199. Among the prodigies recorded of it by Obsequens[k] one is, Solis orbis diminui visus: for which and the rest he adds, Supplicatio unum diem habita, et consules rebus divinis operam dederunt. And then; Eo autem anno Flaminius feliciter in faucibus Epiri contra Philippum Macedoniæ regem pugnavit.

There was no solar eclipse B. C. 199 later than that of August 18, 3 A. M. for the meridian of Paris; which must have been an invisible one. But there was one B. C. 198, February 11 at 3 P. M. for the meridian of Paris, according to Pingré; and consequently about 3.40 P. M. for that of Rome. This must have been the eclipse intended by Obsequens. It was just 19 years distant from that of February 11 B. C. 217—which we considered *supra*; and there could not fail to be a new moon on this day B. C. 198, if there was one Feb. 11 B. C. 217. Its true time for the meridian of Rome would probably be 15 or 20 minutes after three in the afternoon; under which circumstances it might be visible in many parts of Italy.

[i] Livy, xxxii. 8. cf. 7.

[k] Cap. xlviii. Cf. Livy, xxxii. 9. It is curious that though the same prodigies are enumerated in Livy here, as by Obsequens, down to this allusion to the orb of the sun; the enumeration in the former stops short just there: and yet what follows directly after is the same in both.

Its Roman date must have been the Kalends of May U. C. 556: and if it was observed at the time when it happened, it must have been so 46 days after the ingress of the official year. And here Livy comes in to illustrate Obsequens. The first thing which Flamininus did, after entering on office, was to hold and complete the levies for the service in Macedonia; and just as he had done that, and was preparing to expedite his own departure to take the command there, the news of various prodigies arrived at Rome, and interposed a sudden delay. Consulem T. Quinctium Flamininum ita habito delectu . . . properantem in Macedoniam prodigia nuntiata atque eorum procuratio Romæ tenuerunt [l]. And though Livy would imply here also that he set out even from Brundisium at last Maturius quam priores soliti erant consules[l]; it appears from a subsequent allusion [m] that he must in reality have been detained by the business of the procuration of these prodigies for the best part of the year. On the former occasion that procuration had lasted nine or ten months [n]. It must be certain at least that he could not have set out by February 11 the date of the eclipse B. C. 198; and probably he had scarcely by that time begun, much less completed, his levies.

iv. Solar eclipse July 19 B. C. 104.

U. C. 650 Varro U. C. 649 Cap. U. C. 647 Polyb. B. C. 105–104.

C. Marius ii
C. Flavius Fimbria.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle v. 9. 378 days.

Kalendæ.		B.C.	Kalendæ.		B.C.
i Januariæ	Dec. 5 mid.	105	v Apriles	Mar. 26 mid.	104
ii Februariæ	Jan. 3 —	104	vi Maiæ	Apr. 24 —	—
iii Interkalares	Jan. 26 —	—	vii Juniæ	May 25 —	—
iv Martiæ	Feb. 23 —	—	viii Quinctiles	June 23 —	—

vi Kalendas Sextiles July 19 B. C. 104

Pingré, ⊙ eclipsed July 19 10 A. M. Paris B. C. 104.

Among the prodigies recorded of this consular year one is Hora diei tertia solis defectus lucem obscuravit [o]. Pingré

[l] xxxii. 8: 9. [m] xxxii. 28. [n] Supra, p. 7. [o] Obsequens, ciii.

has one solar eclipse B. C. 104 January 22 at 4.30 P. M. for the meridian of Paris; which could not have been that intended by Obsequens. He has another July 19 at 10 A. M. for the meridian of Paris; and therefore at 10. 40 A. M. for that of Rome: and that at this season of the year would have been little more than an hour before noon in kairic time; and must have been described accordingly as the fifth or sixth hour of the day, not the third. Obsequens however might mean the beginning of the eclipse, not the middle; and so understood there might not be much difference between the time assigned by observation, and the calculation of the Tables. For the third hour in kairic time at Rome at this season of the year might denote a time approaching to 8. 20 A. M; and if this eclipse was two hours in attaining to its maximum, its middle would come very near the time determined by Pingre, 10. 40 A. M.* Its Roman date must have been vi Kalendas Sextiles U. C. 650 Varro.

v. Lunar eclipse, May 3 B. C. 63.

U. C. 691 Varr. U. C. 690 Cap. U. C. 688 Polyb. B. C. 63.

M. Tullius Cicero
C. Antonius.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle vii. 2. 378 days.

i	Kalendæ Januariæ	Feb. 26 mid.	B. C. 63
ii	— Februariæ	Mar. 27 —	—
iii	— Interkalares	Apr. 19 —	—
iv	xv Kalendas Martias	May 3	B. C. 63

Nam primum astrorum volucres te consule motus
Concursusque graves stellarum ardore micantes
Tu quoque, cum tumulos Albano in monte nivalos
Lustrasti et læto mactasti lacte Latinas,
Vidisti, et claro tremulos ardore cometas.

* This eclipse in Obsequens too is accompanied by the mention of a swarm of bees, on the same occasion, as that of Silius Italicus, of July 26, supra, likewise was: Examen apum ante ædem Salutis consedit. Nothing could be more natural than such an occurrence as the swarming of bees a little before or a little after either July 26 or July 19, whether B. C. 216 or B. C. 104.

Multaque misceri nocturna strage putasti
Quod ferme dirum in tempus cecidere Latinæ,
Cum claram speciem concreto lumine luna
Abdidit, et subito stellanti nocte peremta est[p].

This last allusion clearly ascertains the fact of a lunar eclipse in the year of Cicero's consulship; and on the night, as it seems, of the day on which he celebrated the Feriæ Latinæ. There were two lunar eclipses B. C. 63; one on May 3, and the other on October 27: and chronologers hitherto appear to have been of opinion that this eclipse of Cicero's consulate must have been the latter. In our opinion it is morally certain it could have been only the former. There was snow on the Mons Albanus at the time; and that would be much more credible of May 3, only six weeks after the vernal equinox, than of October 27, only a month after the autumnal equinox, and the heat of the whole summer. But be this as it may, the night of the eclipse was the night after the Feriæ Latinæ; and the first question is which would be the more probable date of that ceremony in Cicero's official year, May 3 or October 27?

The Feriæ Latinæ, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus[q], were first instituted by Tarquinius Superbus, either to commemorate his victory over the Tyrrhenians[r], or (as seems to have been more truly the case[r]) as a standing memorial of the association of 47 Latin communities of which Rome was the head. They were limited at first to one day. A second was added at the Regifuge, B. C. 508 or 507. A third, after the return of the Plebs, from the secession of B. C. 493[q]. A fourth, according to Plutarch[s], the year before the first Plebeian consulship, B. C. 366. So that from this time forward they must be supposed to have consisted by law of four days; though they are seldom alluded to as if they consisted of more than one.

This ceremony had no stated date in the Roman calendar. It belonged to the class of Feriæ Conceptivæ or Indictivæ,

[p] Cicero, De Consulatu suo. Cf. De Divinatione, i. 11, 18: Ad Attic. i. 19. B. C. 60: ii. 3: Ad Quintum Fratrem, ii. 9.

[q] vi. 95: cf. viii. 87.

[r] iv. 49. Cf. Livy, i. 52: ii. 33. Strabo, iv. 3. Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 16. 279. Auctor De Viris, Tarquinius Superbus.

[s] Camillus, xlii.

which must be celebrated on *some* day every year, but on one appointed for the purpose. Nor in fixing upon this day does it appear that any rule was observed in general, except that of its not being at too great a distance from the beginning of the official year; for to hold these feriæ was always the duty of the magistrates of the incoming year, and one of the first things which they had to attend to. The v Kalendas Maias has been assigned by some of the learned as a stated date of this kind; but without sufficient authority.

B. C. 212 the date of these feriæ was certainly v Kalendas Maias[t]; 42 days after the Ides of March the official ingress at that time. B. C. 177—176 it was iii Nonas Maias[u], 50 days after the ingress. B. C. 172—171 it was the Kalends of June[w], 77 days after the ingress. B. C. 169—168, according to the text of Livy as it stands[x], it was Pridie Idus Apriles, 28 days after the ingress: according to the Acta Diurna, still extant[y], it was Pridie Kalendas Apriles, 16 days after the ingress. And on this occasion they seem to have been purposely fixed to as early a date as possible *.

* It may be inferred from one of Cicero's letters Ad Quintum Fratrem [1], relating to the subject of the espousals of his daughter Tullia to Crassipes, B. C. 56; that the Feriæ Latinæ of that year must have been celebrated on April 1 Roman. Tullia was betrothed on the third day after the *Latiar confectum*; the two days next to which (as we learn from the same testimonies [1]) at this time were commonly considered Dies religiosi. And she appears to have been betrothed Pridie Nonas Apriles [2]; that is April 4 Roman. Middleton in his Life of Cicero dates the marriage April 6 Roman.

If these feriæ were celebrated for three days, and the whole was over when these sponsalia were contracted; they must have begun April 1 Roman; 88 days after the Kalends of January, January 6 B. C. 56. If for four days, they began March 31 Roman; 87 days after it. Neither March 31 Roman nor April 1 Roman this year was Nundinal; though April 3 was. We may collect too from Cicero [3] and also from Dio [4] that for some reason or other the ceremony of the Feriæ Latinæ B. C. 56 was instaurated.

Pliny has a statement with respect to the ceremonial of these feriæ

[t] Livy, xxiv. 2, 3: xxiv. 12. Cf. Vol. ii. 118.
[u] Ibid. xli. 16. 14.
[w] Ibid. xlii. 35.
[x] Ibid. xliv. 19.
[y] See Vol. ii. 45.

[1] ii. 4. 6: Cf. Ad Fam. i. 7. p. 12. [2] Ad Quintum, ii. 4, 5, 6. [3] Ad Quintum Fratrem, ii. 6. [4] xxxix. 30.

It is clear then that this ceremony had no stated date. In Cicero's year, the Kalends of January fell on Feb. 26; and May 2, the day before the eclipse, was 65 days after the ingress. This therefore might have been a very proper date for the Feriæ Latinæ of his year; much more so than October 26, 242 days after the ingress. This latter date is utterly incredible, unless the feriæ to which he alluded were instaurated, and celebrated at an unusual time; or unless the ingress of his proper official year did really fall nearer to October 26 than to May 3.

With regard to this last supposition, if any one should consider it possible, we will mention nothing at present in confutation of it except the following fact; viz. That in the same poem, the Consulatus of Cicero, from which we learnt the occurrence of the lunar eclipse on the night of his Feriæ Latinæ, he makes us acquainted with another natural phenomenon also, which characterised the beginning of his year.

> Principio æterio flammatus Juppiter igne
> Vertitur, et totum conlustrat lumine mundum,
> Menteque divina cœlum terrasque petessit,
> Quæ penitus sensus hominum vitasque retentat,
> Ætheris æterni septa atque inclusa cavernis [z].

The learned have always collected from this description that the planet Jupiter must have been in opposition at the beginning of Cicero's consular year; and at the request of Mons. De La Nauze, author of the Dissertation Sur le Calendrier Romain, in the Mémoires de l'Académie [a], Cassini calculated on what day that must have been the case B.C. 63; and found it to have been April 17 for the latitude of Rome. This date corresponded to the iii Kalendas Interkalares of Cicero's proper official year, U.C. 691. It must be decisive, in our opinion, that the Kalends of January in that year could not have fallen *later* than April 17, though they might have fallen earlier.

Latinæ which probably occurs nowhere else: Siquidem Latinarum feriis quadrigæ certant in Capitolio victorque absinthium bibit [b].

[z] De Divinatione, i. 16, 17. [a] xxvi. p. 219–266: p 245.

[b] H. N. xxvii. 28. p. 33.

With respect to this lunar eclipse of May 3, which Pingrè determined to 3.30 A. M. for the meridian of Paris, we have calculated the opposition in question from our own Tables, and found it May 3 at 4 h. 23 or 24 m. mean time from midnight, for the meridian of Rome. It must have been a very considerable eclipse; the moon's mean distance from the ascending node being almost critically 180°. We may observe too, as a point which would probably be attended to at this time, that the date of Cicero's Feriæ Latinæ Merkedonius 14, May 2, would not fall on a Nundinal day. Merkedonius 17 U. C. 691, May 5 B. C. 63, was Nundinal but not Merkedonius 14.

---

vi. Solar Eclipse August 9 B. C. 49.

U. C. 705 Varr. U. C. 704 Cap. U. C. 702 Polyb. B. C. 50—49.

C. Claudius Marcellus
L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus.

Irregular calendar, Cycle vii. [illegible]. 354 days.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 14 B. C. 50
iii Nonas Octobres Aug. 9 B. C. 49.

Among the prodigies enumerated by Dio, before the departure of Pompey from Brundisium in the consular year of U. C. 705 B. C. 50—49, the first of the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey, one is a total eclipse of the sun; Ὅ τε ἥλιος ἐξέλιπε σύμπας [b].

The actual date of this departure was the Roman Liberalia, the same year; March 17 Roman January 25 Julian B.C. 49: as we shall probably see hereafter. Lucan speaks of a similar phenomenon before Pompey's departure from the city of Rome; and the date of that event was about November 19 B. C. 50: as it may also appear hereafter.

There was only one solar eclipse B. C. 50; August 21 7.45 A. M. Paris. It is possible that Dio might mean this; having confounded the departure from Brundisium with that from Rome. We are inclined however to think that both he and Lucan are to be understood of an eclipse entirely distinct even from this, and which happened the next year. The

[b] xli. 14: cf. 1: 3-6: 11, 12.

eclipse of August 21 B. C. 50, if observed at Rome at all, must have been so soon after sunrise; but the eclipse alluded to by Lucan appears to be intended of one which must have been observed about noon.

> Ipse caput medio Titan cum ferret Olympo
> Condidit ardentes atra caligine currus,
> Involvitque orbem tenebris gentesque coëgit
> Desperare diem [c].

He speaks also of a lunar eclipse the same year, and prior in point of time to this solar one.

> Cornuque coacto
> Jam Phœbe fratrem toto cum redderet orbe
> Terrarum subita percussa expalluit umbra [d].

Now there was no lunar eclipse at all B. C. 50: but there were two B. C. 49: one January 30, 10 P. M. Paris, the other July 25, 0 P. M. Paris; and the former of these would be visible at Rome. There was a solar eclipse the same year, August 9, 0.15 P. M.; the time of which, for the meridian of Rome, must have been as nearly as possible *noon*. We are of opinion then that Lucan confounded these two eclipses of B. C. 49 with the events of B. C. 50; a confusion which, at the time when he was writing, might very easily be explained by the irregularity of the calendar, and by the difficulty of determining the precise beginning of a given year of the civil and consular æra, at this period, relatively to the natural year. The Roman date of each of these eclipses too, both that of August 21 B. C. 50 and that of August 9 B. C. 49, as our calendar shews, was the same; iii Nonas Octobres: and that coincidence might account for their being confounded.

Section IV.—*Cases of doubtful Eclipses.*

To conclude then with the notice of one or two cases of doubtful phenomena, which happen to be on record; and might have been the effect of an eclipse at the time, or might have been purely accidental.

i. U. C. 410 Varr. 409 Cap. 407 Polyb. B. C. 344 we are told by Livy [e] that an Ædes was vowed to Juno Moneta by

[c] Pharsalia, i. 540. Cf. 510–514. [d] Pharsalia, i. 537. [e] vii. 28.

the dictator L. Furius Camillus in the midst of the battle with the Aurunci; and was dedicated the next year: Anno postquam vota erat Ædes Monetæ dedicata, C. Marcio Rutilo iii L. Manlio Torquato ii Coss.; i. e. according to the true reckoning of the consular years at this time, U. C. 411 Varr. 410 Cap. 408 Polyb. B. C. 343. He adds directly after: Prodigium extemplo dedicationem sequutum simile vetusto montis Albani prodigio[f]: namque et lapidibus pluit et nox interdiu visa intendi.

This Ædes appears to have been dedicated on the Kalends of June[g]; which B. C. 343, Decemviral calendar, Cycle v. 10. 355 days, fell on June 15. There was no solar eclipse B. C. 343, except one, on May 23, 9.45 P. M. Paris; consequently invisible.

If however we look back two years in the Tables we find an eclipse of the sun July 13 B. C. 345, at 11 A. M. Paris, according to Pingré; which, by the Decemviral calendar that year, Cycle v. 8. 355, must have fallen on Quinctilis 2, only a month later than the Kalends of June, (June 13,) the calendar date of the dedication of the Ædes in question. Either then the darkness alluded to supra was an accidental phenomenon, or the eclipse of B. C. 345 July 13 must have been confounded with the date of the dedication June 15 B. C. 343. There is an allusion to a similar phenomenon in Orosius[h]; Tunc etiam nox usque ad plurimam diei partem tendi visa est; et saxea de nubibus grando descendens veris terram lapidibus verberavit: the date of which too according to him was U. C. 402 or about that time; and his dates in the æra of the city are often six or seven years behind the Varronian. We confess however that this is a very doubtful case. We have calculated the ecliptic conjunction in question from our own Tables; and found it July 13, at 10 h. 47 m. A. M. mean time, for the meridian of Rome, B. C. 345: and that was a time of the day when a solar eclipse might be observed, and might produce a sensible effect on the light of the sun. But the magnitude of this eclipse appears to have been small. The mean distance of the sun from the ascending node at the time was 15° 13′ and upwards.

[f] Livy, i. 31. Cf. Vol. ii. 432.

[g] Vol. ii. 104, Nundinal cycle, xii.

[h] iii. 7.

ii. U. C. 566 Varr. U. C. 565 Cap. U. C. 563 Polyb. B. C. 189–188.

C. Livius Salinator.
M. Valerius Messalla.

Irregular Calendar, i. 21. 378 days.

Kalendæ Januariæ August 18 B. C. 189
xvii Kalendas Decembres July 17 B. C. 188.

The election of these consuls is noticed by Livy in its proper place[i]: and their entrance on office is dated upon the Ides of March, as usual at this time[i]: that is, Nov. 20 B. C. 189. Directly after, he observes; Priusquam in provincias (Liguria and Gallia[i]) novi magistratus proficiscerentur, supplicatio in triduum pro collegio Decemvirorum imperata fuit in omnibus compitis, *quod luce inter horam tertiam ferme et quartam tenebræ obortæ fuerant*[k].

This looks like a very circumstantial description of the sensible effect of a solar eclipse, which must have been going on between the third and fourth hour of the day; whether it was observed itself at the time, or not. There was only one solar eclipse, B. C. 189, July 27 11.45 P. M. at Paris; and that must have been invisible. And there was only one B. C. 188, July 17 8 A. M. at Paris; and that is described as central all over Europe: and at this season of the year, for the latitude of Rome, it would actually coincide with the third or fourth hour of the day. It is some objection indeed that the consuls on this principle could not have been gone to their provinces before July 17 this year; but those provinces were Gaul and Liguria, in neither of which at this period of Roman history did military operations usually begin until after midsummer. A census had been going on before this time; and the consuls are said to have set out at last Lustro perfecto[k]. This was that of the lxxivth Lustral cycle, June 4 Roman, January 27 Julian, B. C. 189[l]. The Lustrum conditum of this census, about 18 months later, according to rule[m] would actually be celebrated in July, B. C. 188: as nearly as possible about the very time of this eclipse itself.

[i] xxxviii. 35. [k] Ib. 36. [l] Vol. ii. 330. [m] 308.

iii. U. C. 694 Varr. U. C. 693 Cap. U. C. 691 Polyb. B. C. 60.

L. Afranius
Q. Cæcilius Metellus Celer.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle vii. 5. 354 days.

Kalendæ Januariæ February 18 B. C. 60
iv Kalendas Februarias March 16.

Among the prodigies mentioned in Obsequens one is this: Die toto ante sereno circa horam undecimam nox se intendit; deinde restitutus fulgor[n]: the natural inference from which appears to be that there was an eclipse of the sun, late in the day, but not so late as sunset: which made itself perceptible in this manner.

The chapter is headed Q. Metello L. Afranio Coss; and these were consuls U. C. 694 of Varro B. C. 60. There was a solar eclipse this year, March 16 4.45 P. M. Paris; which would answer to the description in the present instance, if that might be assumed as more properly its time for the meridian of Rome: and consequently at this season of the year, (only seven days before the equinox,) as coinciding with the eleventh hour of the day in kairic time for the same latitude.

The Roman date of this eclipse would be January 27 Roman, only 26 days later than the ingress of the official year. There was a similar eclipse March 27 4.15 P. M. Paris, (iii Kal. Feb.) B. C. 61; which might have been equally suitable to the description in Obsequens, but would have belonged to the preceding consular year. If the phenomenon in question was actually the effect of an eclipse at the time, it proves that the consular ingress, i. e. the Kalends of January, whether U. C. 693 or U. C. 694, were earlier than the month of March at least, whether B. C. 61 or B. C. 60; as by our calendar they are seen to have been.

[n] cxxiii.

DISSERTATION XIII.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar.

Cycle i.

CHAPTER I.

Section I.—*On the succession of* Pontifices Maximi *at Rome.*

The superintendance and administration of the calendar at Rome appear to have been committed from the first to the college of Pontiffs. Preliminary therefore to that part of our work on which we are about to enter, viz. the Verification of the Irregular Calendar of our Fasti, cycle by cycle, as long as it was actually in use, we think it desirable to institute a brief survey of the order, succession, and names of the heads or presidents of this college; whose proper title was that of Pontifices Maximi*: as far at least as it can be collected,

* Maximus Pontifex dictus, says Festus, xi. 233. 1, quod maximus rerum quæ ad sacra et religiones pertinent judex sit: vindexque contumaciæ privatorum magistratuumque. Again, xi. 242. 6: Minorum Pontificum maximus dicitur qui primus in id collegium venit. item minimus qui novissimus. Again, xiii. 313. 9: Ordo sacerdotum æstimatur deorum... maximus quisque. maximus videtur Rex, deinde Dialis, post hunc Martialis, quarto loco Quirinalis, quinto Pontifex maximus. itaque in conviviis solus Rex supra omnes accubat: sed Dialis supra Martialem et Quirinalem: Martialis supra proximum: omnes dein supra Pontificem. Rex quia potentissimus: Dialis quia universi mundi sacerdos qui appellatur Dius: Martialis quod Mars conditoris urbis parens: Quirinalis socio imperii Romani Curibus adscito Quirino: Pontifex maximus quod judex atque arbiter habetur rerum divinarum humanarumque.

These distinctions appear to have concerned only the question of pre-

from the time of Numa downwards, by means of the very imperfect and incomplete data which are at present available for any such purpose.

SECTION II.—*On the etymon or derivation of the name of* Pontifex.

The official name and designation of Pontifex are derived by the Roman grammarians either from *posse* and *facere,* or from *pons* and *facere;* the former implying the power or right, entailed by the office upon its possessors, of performing the various duties and services of religion in general; the latter one duty or service in particular, as expressly incumbent on the Pontiffs: viz. that of constructing and of keeping in repair a certain bridge, which is usually explained to have been the *Pons Sublicius* over the Tiber.

Questionable as this latter definition of the name might appear at first sight, it is certainly the more agreeable to etymology of the two; and in all probability it is the truth. Pontifices, says Varro[o], ut Q. Scævola Pontifex Maximus dicebat, a *posse* et *facere.* Pontifices ego a *ponte* arbitror. nam ab iis Sublicius est factus primum, et restitutus sæpe, cum ideo sacra et uls et cis Tiberim non mediocri ritu fiant —Οὗτοι κατὰ μὲν τὴν αὐτῶν διάλεκτον, ἀφ' ἑνὸς τῶν ἔργων ἃ πράττουσιν ἐπισκευάζοντες τὴν ξυλίνην γέφυραν, ποντίφικες προσαγορεύονται[p]. And according to Servius this explanation of the name was as old among the Romans as the Carmina Saliaria: Ex qua etiam caussa Pontifices a ponte sublicio qui

cedence among these several offices and their proper representatives; and it is probable that even these are to be resolved into the comparative antiquity of the offices themselves. That of the Pontifex maximus was probably the youngest of all; that of the Rex (sacrorum or sacrificulus) the oldest; having been originally a part of that of the kings. It is a mistake of Festus to represent the office of the Flamen Quirinalis as borrowed from Cures; and not as expressly instituted by Numa, for the service of Romulus, under the name of Quirinus. This Flamen was certainly younger than either of the other two; and probably the Flamen Martialis was so than the Flamen Dialis. The latter at least must take precedence of the former, because Dius or Jupiter must take precedence of Mars.

[o] De Lingua Latina, iv. 24.

[p] Dionysius, ii. 73: cf. iii. 45: v. 24. Plutarch, Numa, ix. Festus, xvii. 537. 4 Sublicium pontem. Lydus, De Mensibus, iii. 21. p. 41, 42.

primus Tybri impositus est adpellatos tradunt: sicut Saliorum carmina loquuntur[q].

It is to be considered that on one of its sides, and otherwise the most accessible, Rome had no defence but the Tiber; so that it must have been a point of much importance to the security of the city from the first that there should be no bridge over this river but one which could easily be taken down in time of war, and easily rebuilt in time of peace: and therefore must be constructed of wood[r]. But this consideration alone would not perhaps have been a sufficient reason for committing the care of this bridge exclusively to the pontiffs; nor without another, the fact of which we learn from Varro: viz. that certain *sacra*, (which it was their duty to perform both at the proper time and in the proper place,) could be performed only on the *other side* of the Tiber. A bridge being thus constantly wanted for the services of religion, and none being considered safe for political reasons but a bridge of wood; it is no wonder that the care of this bridge should have been delegated to the pontiffs from the first: and that they should even have taken their name from that one of their duties in particular*.

SECTION III.—*On the institution of the College of Pontiffs; and on their number, and the mode of electing them.*

It seems to be agreed that the college of pontiffs was one of the foundations of Numa Pompilius[s]. The number appointed by him at first, inclusive of the Pontifex Maximus, was five[t]: and all these at first also were confined to the order of patricians. U.C. 454 Varro B.C. 300 by the Lex Ogulnia[u] four were added to the number *de plebe*, so as to

* In the course of time a stone bridge was built over the Tiber, instead of the Pons Sublicius; viz. in the censorship of a certain Æmilius: Plutarch, Numa, ix: i. e. Æmilius Scaurus; (cf. Auctor De Viris, Æmilius Scaurus: Juvenal, Sat. iv. 32;) by whom the Pons Milvius or Mulvius also was built. At this time Rome had nothing to fear from a sudden attack *ab extra*.

[q] Ad Æneid, iii. 166.
[r] Cf. Dionysius, ix. 68.
[s] Dionysius, ii. 73: iii. 36. Livy, i. 20: iv. 4: cf. xl. 29. Cicero, De Republica, ii: De Oratore, iii. 19, 73. Plutarch, Numa, ix. Valerius Max. i. i. 12 De Religione. Pliny, H. N. xiii. 27. p. 742. Florus, i. 2. § 2. Auctor De Viris, Numa.
[t] Cicero, De Republica, ii.
[u] Livy, x. 6–9.

make the members of the college, inclusively of the Pontifex Maximus, nine in all. And it seems to have been understood that from this time forward, though four of the pontiffs must be *de plebe*, the Pontifex Maximus and the other four must be *de patribus*. The first Pontifex Maximus, who is known to have been *de plebe*, was Tib. Coruncanius; about thirty years later than the Lex Ogulnia.

With respect to any subsequent augmentation of the numbers of the body, both the college of Pontiffs and that of Augurs received an accession of fifteen members at once, in the time of Sulla, B. C. 81 *exeunte*, or B. C. 80[w]; and one more was added to each of them, and to that of the Quindecimviri, by Julius Cæsar on his return to Rome B. C. 47[x]. And this seems to have been the last addition made to the Pontifical body in particular, so long as we are concerned with it for our proper purpose; that of the history of the administration of the calendar.

As to the election of the members of this college, at first it was by the *cooptatio*, or cooption: i. e. the right of filling up the vacancies which occurred in the body was vested in the body itself. We read of no attempt to disturb this right or to transfer the election to the people before U. C. 609, Q. Fabius Maximus Aimilianus L. Hostilius Mancinus, B.C.145; when, as we learn from Cicero[y], a proposition of that kind was brought forward by C. Licinius Crassus: though it did not succeed; the chief opposer of the motion having been Lælius himself, the principal speaker in this dialogue. Nor does it appear that this privilege of coopting the inferior members of the body was ever taken from the body itself[z]. We may presume at least that, if the election of the Pontifex Maximus was still confined to it, that of the inferior members of the college could not have been transferred to the people. Now even that privilege was not taken from the college before the third consulship of Marius U. C. 651 B. C. 103, according to Velleius Paterculus, the second, U.C. 650 B. C. 104, according to Asconius; when Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, at that time tribune of the people, by a law

[w] Livy, lxxxix. Cf. Servius, ad Æn. vi. 73. Auctor De Viris, Sulla.
[x] Dio, xlii. 51: cf. 55.
[y] De Amicitia, 25, 96.
[z] Cf. Dionysius, ii. 73.

passed for the purpose transferred it to the people[a], along with the right of election to the rest of the Sacerdotia.

The privilege thus vested in the people was again taken from them by Sulla[b], B. C. 81 or 80; no doubt when Metellus his father-in-law was appointed Pontifex Maximus: but it was again transferred to them by the tribune Labienus[b] in the consular year of Cicero and Antonius, B. C. 63; and Julius Cæsar was elected Pontifex Maximus that same year, against Catulus and others[a], by virtue of the power so restored to the people. The consul Mark Antony however took it away from them a second time immediately after the death of Julius Cæsar; and even on the very day of his death, the Ides of March, if Lepidus was appointed Pontifex Maximus by the college in the room of Cæsar himself only on the 16th of March: as he appears to have been[c]. Nor was it ever again restored to them.

It is not necessary however that we should be particularly solicitous about tracing or verifying the succession of Pontiffs from first to last: nor indeed have we the means of doing it. Between the time of Numa and that of the expulsion of the kings the names of two only, so far as we know, are on record. The most important epochs in the history of this succession are those which coincided with the changes or corrections of the calendar; such as the Decemviral, B. C. 449–448, the Irregular, B. C. 209–208, and the

[a] Velleius Paterculus, ii. 12. Suetonius, Nero, ii. § 1. Asconius in Orationem Pro Cornelio, p. 108. Ciceronis Fragmenta, Pro C. Cornelio, ii. Or. viii. Ad Brut. Epp. 5.

It appears from Cicero, xvi. De Lege Agraria, ii. 71, 17: 18: that, because it was *contra fas et religionem* for the people (i. e. *all* the people) *sacerdotia mandare*, Domitius' law vested the right in question in a *part* of the people; apparently in some *nine* of the *tribes:* the same in which Rullus was proposing to vest the election of his Agrarian commissioners. There is reason however to conclude that though the cooption of the inferior members of the college of Pontiffs, down to the time of the law of Domitius, belonged to the body itself; the election of the Pontifex Maximus in particular belonged to the people. There are many instances in Livy of such elections; which from his account must have been held in *comitiis* of some kind, (most probably the *comitia curiata*,) one of the inferior Pontiffs, (though not necessarily the senior, cf. Livy, xxv. 2: 5) presiding, or holding these comitia, and for this purpose. He often too applies the word *creatus est* to the election of the Pontifex Maximus; and on the same occasion, and by way of distinction, that of *cooptatus est*, to the election of one of the minor Pontiffs: and the former term is never applied except to the election of candidates by the people, and *in comitiis* of some kind or other.

[b] Dio, xxxvii. 37: 26: 25. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xiii. 1.

[c] Dio, xliv. 53. Appian. B. C. ii. 131, 132: 118–125: 126–131: v. 126–131.

Julian Correction, B. C. 46–45 : and at each of these points of time we know the name of the Pontifex Maximus who was in office. And perhaps we are most concerned in the knowledge of this fact in the *second* of these instances; that of the abandonment of the regular administration of the calendar, and of the substitution of the irregular one in its stead. The Pontifex Maximus at that time was P. Licinius Crassus, elected in B. C. 212, and still officiating up to the date of his death, B. C. 184. There are some facts upon record also, which give us an insight into his character, and reason to conclude with much probability that the first idea of discarding the regular calendar, for such a reason as that which we explained elsewhere[d], was as likely to have occurred to him as to any of his contemporaries.

SECTION IV.—*Names and order of* Pontifices Maximi *at Rome.*

i. Numa Marcius[e] B. C. 712.

ii. C. Papirius[f].

In office B. C. 508.

iii. Q. Furius[g].

In office U. C. 306 B. C. 448.

[d] Diss. v. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. i. 469.

[e] Livy, i. 20. It is doubtful in what particular relation this Numa Marcius stood to Numa. Numa had three brothers, (Dionysius, ii. 60, Plutarch, Numa, iii.) Ancus Marcius, the third king of Rome, was his grandson, by his daughter Pompilia: Livy, i. 32: Dionysius, iii. 35, 36: ii. 76: Plutarch, Numa, xxi. Plutarch mentions a Marcius, apparently as a συγγενὴς of Numa, at the time when he was made king (Numa vi.) and evidently at that time about the same age as Numa. He accompanied Numa to Rome. *He* was most probably the first Pontifex Maximus. Plutarch (Numa xxi) gives us to understand that this Marcius died at the beginning of the reign of Tullus Hostilius, by a voluntary death; and for a reason which is scarcely credible of him, at that time: viz. disappointment at not being elected king after Numa. He had a son called Numa Marcius too: cf. Tac. Ann. vi. 11: Numa Marcius, in the reign of Tullus Custos urbis. This Numa Marcius was the father of Ancus Martius by Pompilia the daughter of Numa. M. Horatius Pulvillus is sometimes spoken of as Pontifex at the time of the dedication of the Capitol, B. C. 506: Valerius Max. v. x. 1 De Fortibus Patribus: Consolatio attributed to Cicero.

[f] Dionysius, ii. 36.

[g] Livy, iii. 54. Asconius, in Ciceronis Orationem pro Cornelio, p. 106, calls the Pontifex Maximus, who held the comitia for the election of the first Tribuni plebis after the deprivation of the Decemvirs, M. Papirius, not Q. Furius. Possibly the Pontifex Maximus presided at the election of the first Tribuni Plebis B. C. 493, (Livy, ii. 32, 33. Dionysius, vi. 89); and was a M. Papirius.

iv. A. Cornelius.

In office U. C. 324 B. C. 430 [i].

v. Spurius Minucius.

In office U. C. 335 B. C. 419 [k].

vi. M. Fabius [l].

Died U. C. 365 B. C. 389.

vii. P. Cornelius Calussa [m].

Appointed U. C. 422 B. C. 332.

viii. Cornelius Barbatus [n].

In office U. C. 450 B. C. 304.

ix. Tib. Coruncanius [o].
Primus e Plebe.

Appointed U. C. 483 B. C. 271.
or U. C. 499 B. C. 255.

x. Lucius Cæcilius Metellus [p].

Appointed U. C. 511 B. C. 243.
Died U. C. 533 B. C. 221.

[i] Livy, iv. 26: 27.

[k] Livy, iv. 44. Plutarch, De capienda ex inimicis utilitate, vi.

[l] Livy, v. 41. Plutarch, Camillus, xxi. Florus, i. 13. §. 9: cf. §. 26. Ampelius, Liber memorialis, cap. xx calls the Pontifex at the time of the capture of the city by the Gauls, *quo præeunte* the senators devoted themselves, not Fabius, but Fulvius.

Livy, viii. 9: Auctor De Viris, Publius Decius Pater: the Pontifex, who officiated at the self-devotion of the elder Decius U. C. 415 B. C. 339, is called M. Valerius; and, Livy, x. 28, 29: Auctor De Viris, P. Decius Filius: he who did so at that of the younger Decius, U. C. 459 B. C. 295, is called M. Livius. But neither of these seems to have been Pontifex Maximus. Livy calls him in the first instance *Pontifex publicus Populi Romani.*

[m] Livy, xxv. 5. cf. 2. 3.

[n] Livy, ix. 46. 45.

[o] Velleius Paterculus, ii. 128. The Epitome of Livy (xviii.) dates this appointment circa U. C. 499 B. C. 255: 16 years later. Velleius' date seems the more probable one of the two; especially as Ti. Coruncanius was consul B. C. 280, and even then could not have been less than 42 or 43 years of age. Cf. Cicero, De Senectute, 9, 27: 13, 43: De Amicitia, 5, 18: 11, 39: De Oratore, iii. 33, 134.

It was from the time of this Pontifex in particular, according to Cicero, that the style and manner of the Annales Maximi were observed to have become more polished, and more like that of regular history. Cf. Brutus, 14, 55: De Natura, i. 41, 115: iii. 2, 5: De Legibus, ii. 21, 52. Oratio, xxix. Pro Domo, 54, 139. A. Gellius, iv. 6.

[p] Cicero, De Senectute, 9, 30: cf. 17, 61. Livy, Epitome, xix: xxxvii. 51. Dionysius, ii. 66. Valerius Max. viii. xiii. 3 De Senectute Memorabili: i. i. 2 De Religione: iv. 4 De Auspiciis. Pliny, H. N. vii. 45: 49. p. 213: viii. 6: xi. 65, 404. Tacitus, Ann. iii. 71. Ovid, Fasti, vi. 437–454: 417–436. Juvenal, iii. 138 and Schol. in loc. Ampelius, Liber Memorabilis, xx. Augustin, De Civitate, iii. 18. Orosius, iv. 11, who dates the fire of the temple of Vesta when he lost his sight, U. C. 513 B.C. 241, only two years after his appointment.

xi. L. Cornelius Lentulus [q].

In office U. C. 537 B. C. 217.
Died U. C. 541 B. C. 213.

---

xii. P. Licinius Crassus Dives [r].

Appointed U. C. 542 B. C. 212.
Died U. C. 571 cir. March 16 Roman, Dec. 8 B. C. 184.

---

xiii. C. Servilius Geminus [s].

Appointed U. C. 571 B. C. 183.
Died U. C. 574 B. C. 180. cir. Dec. 21.

---

xiv. M. Æmilius Lepidus [t].

Appointed U. C. 575 B. C. 179.
Died U. C. 601 B. C. 153.

---

xv. P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica [u].

Appointed U. C. 601 or 602 B. C. 153 or 152.
Banished U. C. 621 B. C. 133.

---

xvi. P. Licinius Crassus Mucianus [w].

Appointed U. C. 622 B. C. 132.
Died U. C. 624 B. C. 130.

---

[q] Livy, xxii. 10. 57: xxv. 2. 5.

[r] Livy, xxv. 4, 5. An appointment later than the Kalends of May, (May 14,) B. C. 212 at least: cf. 2, 3. Cf. xxxix. 45, 46. 44: xxvii. 5, 6: 8: 21. 22: xxviii. 11. 38: xxix. 10. 13: xxxi. 9: xxxiv. 44: xxxvi. 2: xxxvii. 52. Plutarch, Fabius Maximus, xxv. Valerius Max. i. i. 6 De Religione: vi. ix. 3 De Mutatione Morum: cf. Livy, xxvii. 8. Cicero, De Oratore, iii. 33, 134: De Senectute, 9, 27: 14, 50: 17, 61. Dio, Frag. lxii.

[s] Livy, xxxix. 46 (45): xl. 37. 42. 35. 43.

[t] Livy, xl. 42. 35. 43: Epitome, xliii: cf. xxxvii. 43: xl. 45. 51. 52: xli. 27: Epitome, xlvi. xlvii. xlviii. Polybius, xxiii. 1. § 2: xxxii. 22. § 5: cf. 19. § 7: 20. § 1. Cicero, De Senectute, 14, 50: 17, 61: Oratio, xxix. Pro Domo, 53, 136: xxxv. De Provinciis Consularibus, 9, 20: lv. Philipp. xiii. 7, 15. Valerius Max. iv. ii. 1 De Reconciliatione: vi. vi. 1 De Fide Publica. Obsequens, lxii.

[u] Cicero, De Senectute, 14, 50: De Oratore, iii. 33, 134: De Natura Deorum, iii. 2, 5: Tusculanæ, iv. 23, 51. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 3. Plutarch, Tib. Gracchus, xxi. Valerius Max. i. iv. 2 De Auspiciis: v. iii. 2 De Ingratitudine. Appian, B.C. i. 16. Auctor De Viris, Tib. Gracchus. Anecdota Gr. Par. ii. 13. 1–7.

[w] Livy, lix. Velleius Pat. ii. 4. Strabo, xiv. i. Florus, ii. 20. § 5. Frontinus, De Strateg. iv. v. 16. Plutarch, Tib. Gracchus, ix. xxi. Obsequens, lxxxvii. Cicero, De Legibus, iii. 9, 20: Orat. liii. Philipp. xi. 8, 18. Asconius, In Orat. Pro Scauro, 136. Valerius Max. iii. ii. 22 De Fortitudine: iii. iv. 5 De Humili loco natis: viii. vii. 6 De Studio et Industria. Justin, xxxvi. 4. § 7, 8. Eutropius, iv. 9. Orosius, v. 10. A. Gellius, i. 13.

xvii. P. Mucius Scævola[x].

In office U. C. 631 B. C. 123.

xviii. L. Metellus[y].

In office U. C. 640, 641 B. C. 114, 113.

xix. Q. Servilius Cæpio[z].

Banished, or died in prison, U. C. 659 or 660 B. C. 95 or 94.

xx. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus[a].

U. C. 660 B. C. 94[b].

xxi. Q. Mucius Scævola (Publii Fil.)[c]

Died in office U. C. 672 B. C. 82.

xxii. Q. Cæcilius Metellus Pius[d].

Appointed U. C. 673 B. C. 81.
Died U. C. 691 B. C. 63.

[x] Cicero, Oratio xxix. Pro Domo, 53, 136: De Legibus, ii. 19, 47: 21, 52. 53: De Natura Deorum, iii. 2, 5: De Officiis, ii. 13, 47: De Oratore, ii. 12, 52: De Finibus, ii. 16, 54: iv. 28, 77: Ad Attic. xii. 5. This pontiff was the last who had the keeping of the Annales Maximi, down to the assumed date of that Dialogue, B. C. 91. They appear in fact to have ceased to be kept after his time: cf. Pliny, H. N. viii. 78.

[y] Asconius, in Orat. Pro Milone, 152, 153: Pro M. Scauro, 138. Cf. Festus, xvii. 484. 11 Sacrum Sacrificium.

[z] Valerius Max. vi. ix. 13 De Mutatione Morum. Cf. Justin, xxxii. 3, 10. 11. Orosius, v. 15: 16. Cicero, De Natura, iii. 30, 74. Cf. Fasti Triumphales, U. C. 645 B. C. 108. Livy, lxvii. Strabo, iv. i. A. Gellius, iii. 9. Valerius Max. iv. vii. 3 De Amicitia. Cicero, De Oratore, ii. 28, 124: 48, 199: 49, 201: Brutus, 35, 135: 44, 162: Oratio, xxxvi. Pro Balbo, 11, 28: Cf. Asconius, p. 106: Ad Herennium, i. 14, 24: Oratoriæ Partitiones, 30, 104. 105. Pomponius Mela, iii. 1.

[a] Cicero, Oratio xlii. Pro Rege Dejotaro, 11, 31. Asconius, Pro Scauro, p. 133.

[b] Cf. supra, p. 26. Livy, lxvii. Valerius Max. vi. v. 5 De Justitia. Asconius, Pro Cornelio, p. 108.

[c] Cicero, De Legibus, ii. 19. 47: 21, 52. 53: (cf. Valerius Max. viii. xii. 1 Optimis &c.): De Officiis, i. 32, 116: iii. 17, 70: De Oratore, i. 10, 39: iii. 3, 10: De Natura Deor. i. 41, 115: iii. 32, 80. Asconius, In Oration. Pro Cornelio, p. 98: in Orat. Contra Pison. p. 128. Varro, De Lingua Lat. iv. 24: v. 59. Velleius Pat. ii. 26. Plutarch, Sulla, xxxvi. Livy, lxxxvi. Dio dorus, xxxviii. xxxix. Appian, B. C. i. 88. 87. Florus, iii. 21. § 21. Lucan, Pharsalia, ii. 126. Valerius Max. viii. xv. 6 Magnifica: ix. ii. 3 De Crudelitate. Orosius, v. 20. Augustin, De Civitate, iii. 28. p. 98: iv. 27. A. Gell. v. 19. Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 16. 278.

[d] Dio, xxxvii. 37: cf. 26. Plutarch, Sulla, vi: Cæsar, vii: Romulus, x: Coriolanus, xi. Quæstiones Romanæ, xxxviii. Cicero, xxxiv. Pro M. Cœlio, 24, 50. Asconius, in Or. Pro Cornelio (U. C. 695. p. 91. 94) 107. Macrobius, Saturnalia, ii. 9. 359.

xxiii.	C. Julius Cæsar[e].	
	Appointed U. C. 691 B. C. 63.	
xxiv.	M. Æmilius Lepidus[f].	
	Appointed March 16 Roman, U. C. 710 B. C. 44.	
xxv.	Augustus Cæsar[g].	
	Nonis Martiis U. C. 742 B. C. 12.	

CHAPTER II.

Verification of the Irregular Calendar.

SECTION I.—*On the Verification of the Regular Calendar.*

The verification of our Roman calendar by particular proofs from first to last is a part of our work of which it can neither be said that we have yet any where formally entered upon it, nor yet that we have not already done much towards it. The most considerable portion of this calendar, the period of the regular calendar, extending from B. C. 712 if not from B. C. 750 to B. C. 208, has been as fully illustrated and confirmed in almost every possible way as the most sceptical person could reasonably expect or desire.

A regular calendar does not require to be tested and put to the proof year by year continually. If the cycle of such a calendar is known, and if the rule of its administration is known, a single instance of its agreement with matter of fact at a given point of time is competent to vouch for its truth before and after the same point of time, so long as it con-

[e] Dio, xxxvii. 37: cf. 26. 30: xliv. 5. 17. Velleius Pat. ii. 43. Appian, B. C. ii. 69. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xiii. xlvi. 1. Plutarch, Cæsar, vii. xlii: Pompeius, lxvii: Apophthegmata, Cæsar, ii. Cæsar, De Bello Civili, i. 22. A. Gellius, v. 13.

[f] Dio, xliv. 53: xlv. 17: xlix. 15: liv. 15. 27. Vell. Pat. ii. 63. Livy, cxvii. Obsequens, cxxviii. Appian, B. C. ii. 131, 132: v. 126–131. Cicero, Ad Fam. x. 34, 35: Philipp. v. 15, 40: xiii. 4, 7: 7, 15.

[g] Marmor Ancyranum, iv. 787. Dio, liv. 27, 28. Suetonius, August. xxxi. 1: xliv. 8. Ovid, Fasti, iii. 419. Kalendarium Prænestinum et Maffæanum apud Foggini.

tinues identical with itself, and subject to the same administration. After the many and various proofs of the truth of our Roman Fasti for the period of the regular calendar, which have been produced, we consider it superfluous at this stage of our work to enter on the formal statement of any fresh evidence of the same kind. Enough, and more than enough, has been done for the entire and complete satisfaction of that part of the argument at least.

SECTION II.—*On the Verification of the Irregular Calendar.*

But with regard to the irregular Roman calendar; the administration of a civil calendar which recognized and adopted none of the usual cycles of such a calendar, which professed to observe no law but one which from the nature of the case was variable, which consequently might not be the same for any two years in succession; such an administration, it must be admitted, would appear *a priori* to be involved in the greatest uncertainty. Every year in the actual administration of such a calendar and under such circumstances would seem to require its proper proofs. The matter of fact, howsoever ascertained in one instance, would be no voucher for the same thing in another. The proofs too and confirmations of so precarious and uncertain an administration, not being deducible *a priori* from the nature of the calendar and the rule of the administration itself; they must be obtained, if at all, from testimony *ab extra*: and it is easy to see that such testimony in repeated instances when it might most be wanted might be least at hand.

If then the arrangements and details of our Fasti Romani were liable beforehand to be any where doubted of and called in question, it would seem to be for the duration of this irregular period in particular; during which the actual administration of calendar or civil time at Rome was subject to no fixed and definite rule, or not for any length of time continually. The principal part of our task therefore, in undertaking to verify these Fasti by the proper testimonies and proofs throughout, concerns the truth of their details for this irregular period; and the proper arguments by which it is to be established. It is no slight addition to the difficulty of the undertaking, and to the uncertainty in which

this part of the subject is involved, that these details require to be investigated through a series of 163 years; every one of which *a priori* seems to stand in need of a particular confirmation, before the truth of all collectively can be considered to have been placed out of question.

It would however be an endless task to treat of every year in this period in the same particular and circumstantial manner; even were the means of so doing accessible to us at present: and as that is not the case, it would be unreasonable in any one to expect it from us. Roman history, as it is well known, is no where more defective than for the greater part of the interval from B. C. 208 to B. C. 45. It will be (at least it ought to be) sufficient, if we can show from actual testimony, as often as the necessity of the case and the continuity of one and the same chain of proof shall require, that, for the whole of this intricate and perplexing period, the arrangements of our calendar, arbitrary and positive as they may appear, and different as they may be in one instance from the same things in another, are nevertheless consistent with truth and with the matter of fact perpetually, so far as any thing is known of it with certainty or can be conjectured concerning it with probability.

On the subject however of this irregular administration of the actual Roman calendar from a certain point of time downwards, and whether it was not itself confined within certain bounds by its own principles and by the nature of the end and purpose to which it was directed perpetually, enough has been said[h]; and it is not necessary for us to enter on the explanation of those points afresh. It remains at present only to premise an account of the method in which we propose to proceed in the discharge of this part of our undertaking: and then to set about the task itself.

It will be found convenient to treat the irregular period of the calendar as if it had been distributed into cycles of 24 years, as much as the regular; though in strictness there could have been no such thing as a regular cycle of an irregular calendar. There will be six such cycles of 24 years in the whole of the period in question; and nineteen years more of a seventh. Each of these cycles we shall take in its

[h] Diss. v. ch. iii. Sect. i. Vol. i. 477.

order; and in each we shall endeavour to verify by particular proofs as many years as may serve to authenticate and confirm the remainder of their proper cycle. The most important of these irregular cycles undoubtedly is the last; that viz. which directly preceded the Julian Correction: for which reason, we shall consider it incumbent upon us to verify almost every year of our arrangements in that cycle by distinct and independent proofs. With respect to those which precede it; we shall perhaps be excused if we are somewhat more copious and circumstantial in the exposition of our proofs so long as we have the benefit of the history of Livy; which accompanies the calendar, from the beginning of the irregular administration, down to the 19th year of the second cycle, the consular year of C. Sulpicius Gallus M. Claudius Marcellus, U. C. 588 Varr. B. C. 166[i].

SECTION III.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 1. 377 days.

U. C. 546 Varr. 545 Cap. 543 Polyb. B. C. 209–208.

M. Claudius Marcellus v
T. Quinctius Crispinus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 29 B. C. 209. Nundinal Char. 1.

The truth of our calendar for this particular year is confirmed i. By the year itself, as being the last of the regular calendar, Cycle xi. 1. of the Decemviral correction. ii. By the Nundinal character of the year, unity, and the incidence of the Nundinal day on the Kalends of January. iii. By the prejudice against this form of the Nundinal incidence, which from this time forward took possession of the minds of the Romans; and so strong a possession that, rather than incur the risk of so ominous a coincidence at stated times again, they preferred to give up their regular calendar itself.

The moving cause of this prejudice, and of all those consequences to the calendar which resulted from it, has been explained and pointed out[k]; viz. the death of both the consuls of the year, (one of them Marcellus,) surprised and cut off by Hannibal at one blow: the greatest public misfortune in the opinion of the Romans at the time which had befallen

[i] xlv. 44.

[k] Diss. v. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. i. 469.

them in the course of this second Punic war since the battle of Cannæ. This year then is remarkable as both the *last* of the *regular* and the *first* of the *irregular* period in the history of the Roman calendar; yet not because it was irregularly administered itself, but because it gave the first occasion to the irregular administration of succeeding years. This year itself must have been regular. The intercalation required by the law of the cycle in its first year no doubt took place at the usual time in the Roman February U. C. 546 B. C. 208. The Nundinal incidence too, peculiar to this year of the Nundinal period in the regular course of things, no doubt also must have characterised the first day of the year; as the very prejudice excited against it by what afterwards happened in the same year is sufficient to prove. And neither of these characters of the year, as intercalary in the regular course of the cycle and as distinguished by this particular form of the Nundinal incidence, having yet been interfered with; the year itself must be regarded as to all intents and purposes regular, as much as any which had preceded it.

i. *On the probable time of the year of the death of Marcellus,* B. C. 208.

In fact the death of the consuls of the year, out of which these consequences to the calendar appear to have arisen, could not have happened until the year was more than half over. Something was said before[k] concerning the probable time of that event. Marcellus was certainly still at Rome as late as iii Nonas Quinctiles[l], July 20 B. C. 208: and it admits of a question whether he in particular had yet left it before the middle of Sextilis, whatsoever Crispinus his colleague might have done.

For after mentioning the departure of the latter to his province[m] Livy tells us Marcellus was detained at Rome by the question relating to the dedication of the Ædes Honoris et Virtutis, which had been vowed by him in the year of Clastidium, B. C. 222, and was now ready to be consecrated but for the scruple which occurred to the Pontiffs, about dedicating one and the same chapel to two distinct divinities: In consequence of this objection, as Livy proceeds to inform us,

[k] Diss. v. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. i. 469. [l] Livy, xxvii. 23. [m] Ibid. 25.

a temple intended for Virtus in particular began to be built with all expedition: but he does not tell us what was done with the Ædes already constructed, which on this principle must have been that of Honos. He tells us only that both Ædes were either built or begun to be built in the lifetime of Marcellus; but that neither of them was dedicated by him[m].

In this statement however there is reason to suspect that he must have been mistaken. If we compare Valerius Maximus' account of these proceedings[n] with his we must conclude that both ædes were dedicated by Marcellus; and certainly that one of them was so: and it may be collected from Cicero too[o] that an Ædes Honoris must have been some time or other dedicated by Marcellus, whether an Ædes Virtutis was so or not. In fact it appears from Livy himself[p] that the Ædes Virtutis in particular was dedicated at last U. C. 549 B. C. 205 (so the context implies) by the son of Marcellus*; Septimodecimo anno postquam a patre ejus primo consulatu vota in Gallia ad Clastidium fuerat: i. e. in the seventeenth exeunte, U. C. 532+17=U. C. 549: B. C. 222—17=B. C. 205. There is no allusion to Honos at this time; and the distinction of the Ædes Virtutis from the Ædes Honoris is further implied by the fact that the site of the former was near the Porta Capena[p], that of the latter near the Porta Collina[q]. We must conclude then that the Temple of Honour was dedicated by Marcellus the elder, and that of Virtue by Marcellus the younger: consequently in the year of his death, but before he left Rome. Nor does there seem to be any reason why it should not have been consecrated by him, if it was ready to be so.

With respect then to the difficulty raised by the Pontiffs about dedicating one ædes to two distinct divinities; it appears to us that in order not to detain Marcellus until a distinct chapel could be erected for Virtus, and in order to

* This son escaped at the time of his father's death: see Polybius, x. 32, 5.

[m] Livy, xxvii. 25.
[n] i. i. 8 De Religione: cf. Augustin, De Civitate, v. 12. Lactantius, i. 20.
[o] De Natura Deor. ii. 23, 61.
[p] xxix. 11: cf. 10. 13.
[q] Cicero, De Legibus, ii. 23, 58.

enable him to consecrate that which was already in a state to be consecrated before his departure, the objection in question was removed by a compromise; that of dedicating the ædes now ready to *one* divinity under a *double* name, compounded of that of Honos and of that of Virtus in conjunction, and consequently Honos-virtus*: for the shrine or chapel

* It is certain that the proper title of this Ædes, thus dedicated by Marcellus, was that of the Ædes of Honos-Virtus. Cicero[1] tells us that an Ædes of Honos as well as of Virtus was vowed by Marcellus at the siege of Syracuse, and that one to both was adorned with the spoils which he brought from Syracuse[2]. He himself speaks of it as that of Honos-Virtus absolutely: Cum in templo Honoris-Virtutis[3], &c. We learn from him supra that it was situated near the Porta Collina, though Muratorius has the Ædes of Honos and Virtus near the Porta Capena[4]. In this temple too of Honos-Virtus, we learn from Asconius[5], that M. Claudius Marcellus, grandson of Marcellus, (Consul iii U. C. 602 B. C. 152, and shipwrecked in his passage to Carthage, B. C. 149, as one of the three Legati then sent in the first year of the third Punic war,) erected statues of his grandfather, his father, and himself.

Cicero[6] gives us to understand that even the Ædes of Honos, so vowed by Marcellus, had been dedicated by Q. Maximus, Multis ante annis bello Ligustico: and strictly speaking was renewed by Marcellus. It was lowered by Marius, some time after the Bellum Cimbricum and Tentonicum, for the reason assigned by Festus[7]: on which account Cicero calls it the Monumentum Caii Marii also[8]. It was restored by Vespasian[9].

Mention occurs in Dio[10] of the translation of the *πανήγυρις*, as he terms it, of Τιμὴ καὶ Ἀρετὴ from some other day or days Εἰς τὰς νῦν ἡμέρας: and the context of his narrative fixes the time of that event to U. C. 737 B. C. 17, some time after the birth of Lucius Cæsar, yet before the celebration of the Ludi Sæculares the same year also. On the Ancyran monument[11] there seems to be an allusion to the consecration of an Ædes of Honos and Virtus by the senate in the reign of Augustus just after the consular year of P. Sulpicius and C. Valgius; i. e. B. C. 12: but the passage is corrupt; and nothing certain can be inferred from it. Πανήγυρις however, both in the idiom of Dio and from the reason of the thing, must be intended of more than *one day*, like August 12. That term in Greek

1 In Verrem, Actio ii. Lib. iv. 54, 121: 55, 123.
2 Cf. Plutarch also, Marcellus, xxviii.
3 Oratio xxxii. Pro Sextio, 54, 116.
4 MMCXXVI. Descriptio Urbis Romæ, Regio i. 5 p. 126.
6 De Natura Deorum, ii. 23, 61.
7 xviii. 545. 20 Summissiorem. Cf. Gruter, ccccxxxvi. 3. Gorius, ii. 248. 8. Morcelli, cclxxxxi: 1. 266. Vitruvius, vii. Præf. p. 196.
8 Oratio xxxii. Pro Sextio, 54, 116. De Divinatione, i. 28, 59.
9 Pliny, H. N. xxxv. 37. 505. Cf. Servius, ad Æn. i. 8. Ausonius, Epp. ad Symmachum: iv. Symmacho.
10 liv. 18. 11 Livy, iv. 787.

(Fanum or Ædes), which Marcellus the elder was known to have some time or other in his lifetime actually dedicated, appears to have been known also by this peculiar name of the Ædes of Honos-Virtus; neither that of Honos as such, nor that of Virtus as such, but that of both under one name, Honos-Virtus, or that of Honos as combining the name and character of Virtus also.

Now it appears from the Amiternine calendar[r] that the feast-day of Honos and Virtus in the Julian calendar was August 12; which in the Decemviral calendar corresponded to Sextilis 12: and this fact also proves that the same day in the calendar was sacred to both. We are entirely of opinion that the Ædes Honoris was dedicated on Sextilis 12 B. C. 208 by Marcellus the elder; and the Ædes Virtutis on Sextilis 12 B. C. 205 by Marcellus the younger. It is observable that in the calendar[r] Honos precedes Virtus; Honori et Virtuti—not Virtus Honos; Virtuti et Honori: implying that the holiday of the former though nominally the same as that of the latter was really older than it. This day B. C. 208 coincided with August 27; B. C. 205 with July 29: and it was not Nundinal in either of those years, though Sextilis 11, August 26 B. C. 208 was so. It follows that Marcellus must have been still at Rome as late as August 27 B. C. 208. How long after he met with his death we endeavoured to collect from Livy[s]. Polybius appears to date it a little before Scipio's victory over Hasdrubal, at Bæcula, in Spain; or synchronously with it[t]: and that did not long precede the close

would properly answer to Ludi in Latin. We discover no Ludi of Honos and Virtus in the extant fragments of the Julian calendar. Nor are there any such in the Fasti of Ovid; which go through the first six months of that calendar. We find such Ludi however in the Constantian calendar for *three* days; from the iv Kalendas Junias (May 29) to the end of the month. These are probably what Dio meant by the πανήγυρις in question, and by its date in his time. And yet it is very unaccountable that it should have been attached to those days by Augustus and yet should not appear either in the Fasti of Ovid, or in the Maffæan or Exquiline or Venusine calendar[12]: each of which is entire either for the whole of the Roman Maius, or for the end of it.

[12] Apud Foggini.

[r] Apud Foggini.

[s] Diss. v. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. i. 469.

[t] x. 32, 33: 34–40. Cf. Livy, xxvii. 17–20.

of the year's campaign. But in the date of this battle of Bæcula the arrangement of the fragments of Polybius differs from Livy; according to whom this battle was an event of B. C. 209 not of B. C. 208.

SECTION IV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 2. 356 *days.*

U. C. 547 Varr. 546 Cap. 544 Polyb. B. C. 207.

C. Claudius Nero
M. Livius Salinator ii.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 10 B. C. 207 Nundinal Char. 8.

Postera lux melior: superat Masinissa Syphacem:
Et cecidit telis Asdrubal ipse suis [u].

The day which is here described is viii Kalendas Julias, June 23 Roman, in the Decemviral calendar; the day after ix Kalendas Julias, June 22 Roman, the day of the battle of the Lacus Thrasimenus.

The traditionary date of two remarkable victories gained by the Romans, at different times, but on the same day of the month at each, June 23 Roman B. C. 207 and June 23 Roman B. C. 202, is thus ascertained; for there can be no doubt that the former of these must be intended of the victory of the Metaurus, near the Roman colony of Sena on the Adriatic [w], over Hasdrubal son of Hamilcar Barcas and brother of Hannibal, in the consular year of Nero and Livius, U. C. 547 Varr. B. C. 207. There is a difficulty certainly in the allusion, which also occurs here, to the mode of the death of Hasdrubal himself on the same occasion. That he fell in this battle, all our authorities are agreed [x]: that he fell by his own hand, or by the hands of his own followers, (one of which facts appears to be implied by Ovid here,) is no where on record *. But this difficulty does not affect the

* There was another Hasdrubal, who makes a figure in the history of these times; the son of Gisco, and the father of Sophonisba [l]. He was

[u] Ovid, Fasti, vi. 769.

[w] Polybius, ii. 19. §. 12: 17, 7. Planted B. C. 284. Cf. Vol. ii. 168.

[x] Polybius, xi. 1. §. 2—2. §. 1. Livy, xxvii. 49. Appian, vii. 52. Zonaras, ix. 9. 432 C.

[l] Polybius, xiv. 1–8. Livy, xxvii. 20: xxix. 23: xxx. 5–8: 11. Appian, viii. 10: 27.

date of the battle. Every one therefore is at liberty to think of it as he pleases. We shall proceed to illustrate the date; though as briefly as the nature of the case will allow.

i. *On the date and the circumstances of the Battle of the* Metaurus.

It must be observed first of all that, though the regular administration of the calendar had been already abandoned, no perceptible effect could yet have been produced thereby on the relation of the civil year to the natural. This first of the irregular years of the calendar would contain only one day more than the same year in the regular order of the cycle would have done; and that day too one which would come in at the end of December, instead of the usual place in February.

The comitia of this year, and the election of the consuls of the year, C. Claudius Nero and M. Livius Salinator ii, were mentioned by Livy in their proper order of time [y]: and we may take it for granted that, after the death of both the consuls of the preceding year, the election of those of this would not be later than usual. Hasdrubal was *then* in Gaul, or reported to be so. The people of Marseilles had already sent word to Rome that he was on his way to Italy; and deputies, despatched expressly to ascertain the truth of that report [z], had just returned announcing that he might certainly be expected to cross the Alps Proximo vere; nec tum eum quidquam aliud morari nisi quod clausæ hieme Alpes essent. These comitia were probably held in the Roman December, U. C. 546, which began December 12 B. C. 208; or at the

the commander of the Carthaginians B. C. 202, when Scipio surprised their camp and burnt it: for which the Carthaginians at first condemned him to death [2]; though they afterwards rescinded that sentence [3]. He was at Carthage and alive just before the battle of Zama [4]; and we are told by Appian that having concurred with the senate at that time in recommending some measures to the people, which the state of their affairs required, he displeased them so much that in order to escape from their fury he took poison; and so destroyed himself. Ovid however could not possibly mean *this* Hasdrubal.

[y] xxvii. 34: 33. [z] xxvii. 36.

[2] Appian, viii. 17–24: 27: 29. 30. [3] Ibid. 36. [4] Ibid. 38.

latest in the Roman January U. C. 547, the date of which was January 10 B. C. 207: and at neither of these times is it credible that Hasdrubal could yet have ventured to begin his march across the Alps, though he might have been already arrived at the foot of them.

The ingress of the official year of Nero and Livius is next mentioned[z]; and we may presume at the usual time, the Ides of March U. C. 547 March 22 B. C. 207. How soon after they actually repaired to their provinces is not stated. There were prodigies of various kinds, even after the ingress, which would require to be expiated; besides two Novemdialia sacra (16 days at least) and three or four days more which are particularly alluded to[a]. The business of the levies too which required more care than usual this year, even after these prodigies and their procuration, had still to be transacted[b]: and that was going on when letters arrived from L. Porcius, the Prætor of Gaul for the year[c], (consequently much later than the Ides of March when he too must have entered on office,) announcing that Hasdrubal was now on his way: Movisse ex hibernis et jam Alpes transire[d].

Now Appian tells us that Hasdrubal accomplished the same march on this occasion in two months which on the former occasion of Hannibal's march had taken up five or six[e]. As then he was certainly in Italy by the end of May, he must have set out across the Alps by the end of March; and these tidings relating to his movements, which the Romans heard from the Prætor Lucius Porcius Licinus, would probably reach Rome before the end of April. This news, says Livy, determined the consuls to take the field without further loss of time: Raptim confecto delectu. We may conclude then that they must have set out for their respective destinations, (Livius to encounter Hasdrubal at the foot of the Alps, Nero to watch the movements of Hannibal, at this time or just before it still wintering among the Bruttii[f],) early in May at the latest.

It is not necessary to trace the movements of Nero and Hannibal, after the arrival of the former in presence of the latter, from Venusia to Grumentum; thence to Venusia

[z] xxvii. 36. [a] Ibid. 37. [b] xxvii. 38. [c] xxvii. 36: 35. [d] xxvii. 39. [e] vii. 52. Cf. 4: Livy, xxvii. 39. [f] Ibid. 35: 39: 40, 41.

again; afterwards to Metapontum; and finally to Canusium[g]: where both were encamped when Hasdrubal's messengers, conveying letters from him to Hannibal, were intercepted and brought to Nero; in consequence of which he formed the resolution of marching at once, with part of his army, to the assistance of his colleague. It is clear however that by these various manœuvres on both sides a good deal of time must have been occupied.

It is proper then now to consider the Julian date of the Roman June 23d, at this period of the history of the calendar. It appears from our Fasti that it coincided with June 29. Nero it is said[h] marched day and night; and so he might have done at this season of the year, midsummer. But the direct distance from Canusium to Forum Sempronii * on the Metaurus where Livius was posted[i] was 250 Roman miles at least; and by road it would be 280[k]: and though we are told that when returning he traversed the same space of ground in six nights and six days only[l]; it is clear that he used more expedition in returning than in going.

Now this is an important circumstance of distinction; and it is implied by it that he had probably the benefit of moonlight in returning, though not in going; or not to the same extent on his march to Sena as on his march back again: though Silius Italicus[m] appears to reverse this state of the case; as if there was moonlight when he set out on his march to join Livius, and none when he arrived at his camp. But the truth is explained by the Roman date of the battle, reduced to our calendar. For that it appears was June 29. Now there was a solar eclipse July 17, 4.45 P. M. Paris, B. C. 207; so that there must have been a new moon on June 18 previously. By our general Lunar Calendar, Period xiii. Cycle viii. 17, the new moon of Sivan bore date June 19 at midnight. It may therefore be safely assumed that there

* Forum Sempronii (hod. Fossombrone) on the Metaurus, not far from Sena Gallica (hod. Senigaglia), (see D'Anville, i. 166,) may be assumed as the scene of the battle. Cf. Silius Italicus, xv. 552: 556, 557.

[g] Livy, xxvii. 40—43.
[h] Ibid. 45.
[i] Ibid. 46.
[k] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, i. 252.
[l] Livy, xxvii. 50. Cf. xxviii. 9.
[m] Punica, xv. 560—576: 591: 616—626: 809 sqq.

was a moon ten days old complete, on the day of the battle, June 29; and 16 days old complete, when Nero arrived at his old quarters in presence of Hannibal, six days after, on July 5. It is clear then that he must have had the benefit of moonlight all the night, for his return at least; whether for his march to Sena or not.

The battle was fought the day but one after his junction with Livius[n]. Consequently, if the date of the battle was June 29, that of this junction was June 27: and June 27 *at night*[o]. Hasdrubal moved from his camp on the night before the battle (the night of June 28) Prima vigilia[p]: and that too is some argument of a moonlight night. The battle was decided by noon[q] the next day. The *sitis et calor*[r] are both particularly mentioned; and the battle was fought under the culminating ascendancy of an Italian sun, only three days after the solstice June 26.

We may presume then that if it required six days and six nights to march back from Sena to Canusium, with the advantage of moonlight as well as daylight all that time, it must have required twelve days and nights to march from Canusium to Sena: and even that would be at the rate of 22·3 miles a day. On this principle, if he arrived at Sena on the evening of June 27, he must have set out from Canusium on June 15; three or four days before the change of the moon, June 18 or 19.

Livy mentions that the first rumour of the victory reached Rome only two days after the battle*[s]; and though he treats this as almost incredible, instances are not wanting, either in

* Cf. generally with the preceding, Polybius xi. 1—3: Appian, vii. 52, 53: Zonaras, ix. 9. 432. C—433 D: Valerius Max. vii. iv. 4 De Strategematis: Florus, ii. 6. § 50—52: Eutropius, iii. 10: Orosius, iv. 18: Frontinus, De Strateg. i. 1. 9. We may observe on this subject too, that had we entered before this part of our work on the history and explanation of the Punic calendar our readers would have had reason to know that the date of the battle in that calendar was something of importance; in particular, whether it coincided with the 22nd of any Punic month. The Carthaginians had special reasons for avoiding that day of the month; and Hasdrubal in giving battle on this occasion was acting more or less voluntarily. The actual date of the battle in the Punic calendar was the 17th of the ninth month.

[n] Livy, xxvii. 45, 46, 47. [o] Ibid. 45. [p] Ibid. 47. [q] Ibid. 47, 48. [r] Ibid. 48. [s] Ibid. 50.

Roman or in Grecian history, (and well authenticated instances too,) of the same rapid transmission of the news of important events. But in the present instance there was really nothing extraordinary in this fact. The distance from Forum Sempronii to Rome in a straight line was only 145 Roman miles = about 163 by road: and at the full of the moon, and by travelling night and day, what difficulty would there be in accomplishing that distance in two nights and two days, at the rate of 80 or 81 miles in a night and a day?

SECTION V.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 5. 356 *days.*

U. C. 550 Varr. 549 Cap. 547 Polyb. B. C. 205—204.

M. Cornelius Cethegus
P. Sempronius Tuditanus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 13 B. C. 205. Nundinal Char. 4.

Date of the Advectio *of the* Mater Deum.

This year was that of the Advectio of the Mater Deum or Mater Idæa, (the Phrygian Cybele,) to Rome[t]. The day of her actual reception at Rome and of the first festivity celebrated there in honour of her was Pridie Idus Apriles[u], April 12 Roman, the same year; the same day which was ever after considered sacred to her in the Roman calendar, no doubt because it had been so devoted in this first instance.

Now should we ever be permitted to treat of the ancient Phrygian calendar, we hope to make it clearly appear that *this* day was purposely fixed upon as the fittest date in the Roman calendar of the time being for the first ceremony of this kind at Rome in honour of this Phrygian goddess, because it coincided with the stated date of the proper Phrygian ceremony in honour of the same goddess and in her proper calendar at the very same point of time. This stated date in the Phrygian calendar at that point of time was March 22: and March 22, as our calendar shews, was the proper Julian date of Pridie Idus Apriles, April 12 Roman, U. C. 550. The Kalends of January[w] that year fell Dec. 13 B. C. 205; the Kalends of April March 11 B. C. 204: and therefore Pridie Idus Apriles

[t] Livy, xxix. 10—14. [u] Ibid. 14. [w] Ibid. 10. 13.

March 22. This coincidence consequently is an equally exact and striking confirmation both of our Phrygian calendar for the time being, and of our Roman.

It is almost superfluous to observe under such circumstances that the Roman Aprilis at this time had fallen back nearly into a state of coincidence with the Julian March; and something to that effect might have been suspected of this year from what we find on record in Livy relating to a different subject, though nothing had been known of the true Julian date of the Roman day of the reception in question.

The inquiry, instituted at Rome, into the charges preferred by the people of Locri against Pleminius, the legate of Scipio, is supposed to have been instituted *this* year, but after the reception of the Mater Idæa[x]; that is, after Pridie Idus Apriles. And yet Pomponius, the prætor of the year, to whom Sicily had been assigned[y], according to Livy was not yet gone to his province[z]. That would be probable not much later than March 22. It appears too that winter was only just over at Carthage[a], when these things were going on at Rome.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 6. 356 *days.*

U. C. 551 Varr. 550 Cap. 548 Polyb. B. C. 204—203.

Cn. Servilius Cæpio
C. Servilius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 4 B. C. 204. Nundinal Char. 8.

We purposely pass over B. C. 205—204. Nor, after the proof of our Roman calendar for B. C. 202 which has been supplied by the date of the battle of Zama[b], should we have thought it necessary to say any thing more in illustration or

[x] Livy, xxix. 19: cf. 16—22: 6. 8. 9. cf. 20—22. Diodorus, Fragm. xxvii.
[y] Ibid. 11. 13.
[z] Ibid. 20, speech of Q. Metellus:
[a] Livy, xxix. 23.
[b] Diss. v. ch. i. sect. vii. Vol. i. 447.

verification of it for that year, or for the year before it, B. C. 203, had not this latter year been the true date of Scipio's expedition to Africa, which ultimately gave occasion to the decisive battle of Zama; and had not Livy erroneously dated it the year before. For the sake of demonstrating and at the same time correcting this anachronism of his, and thereby of confirming our former assertion on that point [b], we hope to be excused, if we dwell on the chronology of these two years somewhat in detail.

i. *On the true date of the expedition of Scipio to Africa.*

The consular year of P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus and P. Licinius Crassus [c] entered on the Ides of March U. C. 549 Varr. March 3 B. C. 205. No particulars of this year are related, so far as Scipio was concerned, except the discussion and decision of the question whether Africa should be decreed to him as his province *extra sortem*, or not [d]; and, when that had been settled in the affirmative, the construction of the fleet, with which it was intended he should proceed thither. The building of this fleet was completed with so much despatch that the ships were launched on the 45th day after the timber of which they were made had been felled in the woods [e]. With this fleet he set sail to Sicily; and we may judge of the time of the year at which he must have put to sea, from the fact mentioned so soon after his arrival in the island; viz. his laying up his ships in dock at Panormus in order to season them through the winter: Quia ex viridi materia raptim factæ erant, ut *in sicco hibernarent* [g]. It was approaching to winter then when he arrived in Sicily. Consequently no expedition to Africa could have been carried into effect *that* year at least. The earliest possible time for it would be the next: and the next year, it must be admitted, Livy supposes it to have actually taken place.

But in that case it is evident that Scipio could not have lost a moment of time in carrying into execution the purpose for which he had been sent from Rome. How then shall we account for that change of resolution meanwhile at home, and on the part of the Roman senate, with regard to this

[b] Vol. i. 477. [c] Livy, xxviii. 38. [d] Ibid. 40—45. [e] Ibid. 45.
[f] Ibid. 46. [g] Ibid. xxix. 1.

purpose; the fact of which we gather from Valerius Maximus[h]? so much so that they actually prohibited the further prosecution of the very undertaking, for which Scipio had been despatched from Rome, and before the earliest possible time at which it could have been carried into effect. What reason too, on this principle, could there have been to find fault with the dilatoriness of Scipio? or what occasion could have been given by his conduct for the following observation of Seneca's? Quid Scipio? nonne relicto Hannibale ... bellum in Africam transtulit tam lentus ut opinionem luxuriæ segnitiæque malignis daret[i]? The case is different if he delayed the actual invasion of Africa two years after it had been resolved upon, and after he himself had been commissioned to execute it. There would be abundance of time in that case to shake the confidence of the senate in its own resolution; and abundance of reason apparently to criminate and complain of Scipio: as if he was wasting two valuable years in total inactivity.

Again, after the mention of the mission of Lælius from Sicily to Africa, and of his return to Sicily again[k], we have the account of the capture of Locri[l]; and both these events are dated by Livy in B. C. 205, later than the arrival in Sicily but not later than the close of the year[m]. The affair of Pleminius arose out of that capture[n]; and it has been seen supra[o] that this inquiry according to Livy was committed to the prætor of Sicily, Pomponius[p], sometime after April 12 Roman (March 22 Julian) B. C. 204: and consequently in the spring of U. C. 550[q], the consular year of M. Cornelius Cethegus P. Sempronius Tuditanus. Yet he himself speaks of this very inquiry, and so committed to this Prætor Pomponius, as *three years* complete before U. C. 554 the consular year of P. Sulpicius Galba C. Aurelius Cotta

[h] iii. vii. 1 De Fiducia sui.

[i] De Ira, i. xi. 5: Operum, i. 20. Cf. Dio, Fragmenta, lxiv. Plutarch, Cato Major, iii. Cato the elder was one of those who joined in the outcry against Scipio at Rome. He was previously his quæstor in Sicily, (cf. Cornelius Nepos. Cato, i. Also Livy, xxix. 25. Cicero, Brutus, 15, 60), and left him in disgust because, as it appeared to him, he was wasting the public means in an unwarrantable manner. Livy supposes that he was still his quæstor even when he sailed at last to Africa.

[k] Livy, xxix. 1. 3—5.

[l] Ibid. 6, 7.

[m] Ibid. 10.

[n] Ibid. 8, 9: 16—22: cf. xxxi. 12: xxxiv. 44.

[o] Page 46.

[p] cf. xxix. 11. 13: 20—22: 25.

[q] xxix. 10. 13.

B. C. 200: Senatui placere quæstionem de expilatis thesauris eodem exemplo haberi quo M. Pomponius Prætor triennio ante habuisset[r]. On this principle that inquiry must really have been instituted by him in the spring of B. C. 203: and consequently the complaints of the Locrians also against Pleminius must have been preferred not long before the same time. The truth therefore is that the mission of Lælius to Africa and the capture of Locri after his return were really events of B. C. 204, not of B. C. 205; and were the only events which are on record for that year, the first after Scipio's arrival in Sicily. It was not likely that Lælius would be sent to Africa B. C. 205, immediately after his arrival; when Scipio laid up his fleet in the docks, as unfit for sea, and because the winter was at hand. The charges against Pleminius must have arisen out of the events of B. C. 204, and must have been preferred at Rome either that year, or early the next. It is clear at least even from Livy's account that the inquiry into them must have been instituted in B. C. 203; in the year of Scipio's actual passage into Africa: so much so, that it was supposed he had already got to Africa even before it began[s].

Again, after the landing of Scipio in Africa, it is not possible even from Livy himself to make out more than *one* winter spent in that country; the winter occupied by the siege of Utica[t], and followed the next year by the battle of Zama. It is not possible from the accounts of Appian[u] to make out more than one year, or rather than *part* of one year, between the landing and Zama: though even he must imply that the proper campaign of the first year in Africa must have come to an end when Scipio converted the siege of Utica into a blockade[w]. The history of Polybius, for this part of its details, exists only in fragments. Yet his accounts evidently begin with the *second* year in Africa; and after the winter devoted to the siege of Utica: Ὁ δὲ Πόπλιος ἐν τῇ

[r] xxi. 12: cf. 5.

[s] xxix. 19, 20, 21, 22. It is no objection that, xxxviii. 51, 52, in a part of his history which belongs to U. C. 567 B. C. 187, Livy dates this inquiry 17 years before. He certainly assumes it himself to have been instituted in B. C. 204; from which year to B. C. 187 would be 17 years complete. And yet it would be 17 current equally truly from B. C. 203.

[t] xxix. 35—xxx. 3: cf. Zonaras, ix. 11. 437 A—12. 438 B.

[u] viii. 6-48. [w] viii. 13-16.

Λιβύῃ κατὰ τὴν παραχείμασίαν..: περὶ τὴν τῆς Ἰτύκης πολιορκίαν[x]. There can be no doubt that the battle of Zama was fought before the *next* winter. There could not consequently have been more than one campaign in Africa, before that of the year of Zama: and if this was that of B. C. 202, the former must have been that of B. C. 203. The year of Zama, B. C. 202, cannot be called in question. It is fixed by the eclipse of October 19 that year. It appears even from Livy that Hannibal evacuated Italy, just before this battle, Sextodecimo anno[y], or Post sextumdecimum annum[z]. Now he arrived in Italy at the end of October, or the beginning of November, B. C. 218; as it might be proved to a demonstration both from the account of his passage of the Alps, and from the course of subsequent events down to the battles of Ticinus and Trebia. We shall see hereafter that he quitted it to return to Africa in the month of September. If so these statements of Livy's cannot be understood of less than 16 years complete; and the first being dated October B. C. 218 the last would expire in or before October B. C. 202. Polybius speaks of Hannibal as having been 17 years incessantly warring with the Romans up to the date of Zama[a]; and that might have been said with truth any time after the actual beginning of the 17th year, October B. C. 202. Yet he too reckons his occupation of Italy previously only at 16 years complete[b] *.

* Polybius tells us[1] that Hannibal was nine years old when he left Carthage, and more than 45 when he returned again, for the first time, after Zama: and that was not many days later than the battle. Livy reckons this to be the 36th year since he had quitted Carthage as a boy: Sexto ac trigesimo post anno quam puer inde profectus erat[2]. And that is substantially to the same effect as the statement of Polybius.

The mission of Hamilcar his father into Spain after the close of the war with the mercenaries may be dated about the beginning of October B. C.

[1] xv. 19. § 3: ii. 1 § 6: iii. 11. § 5. Cf. Livy, xxi. 1. Cornelius Nepos, Vita, 2. Valerius Max. ix. iii. 3 De Ira et Odio, Externa. Auctor De Viris, Hannibal. Ampelius, Liber Memorialis, xxviii.

[2] xxx. 35. 37. (cf. xxxv. 19. Polybius, iii. 10, 7—12, 1.) Orosius, iv. 19.

[x] xiv. 1, 2: cf. § 6: 2, 1: 10, 9.

[y] xxx. 20, 21.

[z] xxx. 28: cf. 30. 32: xxxii. 21: Appian, viii. 134.

[a] xv. 11, 6: cf. xxiv. 9. § 5.

[b] xi. 19, 5: cf. Vol. i. Diss. v. ch. i. sect. vii. p. 449.

We need not hesitate therefore to correct Livy's date of the invasion of Africa, B. C. 204, by B. C. 203. It is true that a good deal of confusion and perplexity is hereby introduced into part of his accounts; more especially with regard to the beginnings and the endings of some consular years. But for this he himself is responsible. In the survey which we propose to institute of the events of these two years we shall pay no regard to any thing but the actual matters of fact which are on record between the landing of Scipio and the battle of Zama. These facts even in Livy were most probably taken from Polybius; and the truth of these *per se* we have seen no reason to call in question.

ii. *On the chronology of the first campaign in Africa, that of B. C.* 203.

The true year then of the passage of Scipio from Sicily to Africa being B. C. 203, we are told of the day before his departure[c] that he took with him 45 days' supplies of provision for his army. The next day he set sail[d]; and we have *that* day, and the *night* following, and *sunrise* the next morning, (when he was now within five miles of the coast of Africa, opposite to the promontory of Hermæum,) each specified in its turn: and then another *night* and another *morning*, before he actually landed. So that he was *two days* and *two nights* complete, but no more, in making the passage.

237[3]; and this return of Hannibal to Carthage after Zama being dated towards the end of October B. C. 202, it would be truly *in* the 36th year from the former.

Polybius allows Hamilcar *nine* years in Spain: Ἔτη σχεδὸν ἐννέα[4]: Hasdrubal eight[5]: i.e. ten years in all from the death of Hamilcar, to the beginning of the second Punic war. But Hannibal had been two years in command before the siege of Saguntum[6]. The true dates are probably as follows:

Hamilcar Barcas, B. C. 237. Nine years nearly complete.
Hasdrubal, B. C. 228. Seven years and part of an eighth.
Hannibal, B. C. 221. Two years and six months before B. C. 218.

[3] Polybius, i. 88: ii. 1. Livy, xxi. 1. Cf. Diodorus, Fragm. lib. xxv.
[4] ii. 11, 7: iii. 10. § 7.
[5] ii. 36, 1: ii. 1, 9: 13, 36: iii. 10. § 7: 13, 3. Cf. Diodorus, Fragm. lib. xxv.
[6] iii. 13: 14: 15, 3: 17, 1: cf. 33, 5: iv. 66, 8. Livy, xxx. 1. 2. 4. 5: 5–15: 16. 41. 43. Eutropius, iii. 3.

[c] Livy, xxix. 24. 25.
[d] Ibid. 27. Cf. Appian, viii. 13.

Soon after the landing Scipio established his head-quarters at Utica[e]; Hanno the Carthaginian general being posted at Saleca, 15 miles distant: and it is implied that it was now the summer season[f]. The next event was the victory over Hanno[g], followed by the capture of Saleca; but how long after the landing is not stated. Some interval however is supposed; and it might have amounted to several days: particularly under so cautious a commander of the Romans as Scipio, after first setting foot on hostile ground, and as yet untried.

On the day of this victory too the fleet returned from Sicily[h] to which it had been despatched soon after the landing in Africa, with the booty first taken on that occasion[i]: and to go to Sicily and to come back again thence, even without delay, would require eight or ten days' time at least.

After this there was an expedition into the interior of the country, which lasted *six* days[k]. On the *seventh* Scipio returned to his camp, and prepared to lay siege to Utica; and when that siege had now been going on *forty* days, Syphax arrived with his forces and took post not far from Utica: which circumstance together with the advanced season of the year induced Scipio to turn the siege into a blockade, and to intrench himself on the promontory within his own lines for the winter: Jam enim hiems instabat[l]. And here Livy closes *his* account of the first year's proceedings in Africa.

We have then only *forty-seven* days actually specified. But these were reckoned from the second arrival of the fleet with fresh supplies: and when we consider that Scipio took with him 45 days' supplies at first, we shall conclude it to be extremely probable that *those* 47 days are to be reckoned from the close of *these* 45 days; and that both the mission of the fleet to Sicily and its return to Africa again were purposely so ordered that these fresh supplies for the army should come in just as the first were about to fail. On this principle the entire duration of the campaign, from the date of the departure from Sicily to the time of the arrival of

[e] Livy, xxix. 28. 34. Cf. Appian, viii. 14. Lucan, Pharsalia, iv. 585. 656–660.

[f] Cf. Livy, xxix. 28.

[g] Livy, xxix. 34, 35.

[h] Ibid. 35.

[i] Ibid. 29.

[k] Ibid. 35. Cf. Appian, viii. 14–16.

[l] Livy, xxix. 35: cf. xxx. 3. Appian, viii. 16. Zonaras, ix. 12.

Syphax and of Scipio's going into winter quarters, may be estimated as nearly as possible at 45 + 47 or 92 days. And since it is clearly supposed that their termination coincided with the *extremum auctumni*, the only question will be what is to be understood by the *extremum auctumni?* whether the autumnal equinox merely, or the beginning of winter? at least of that period of the year which was ordinarily so called in these times?

In our opinion, this latter only could have been meant by it. The autumnal equinox merely never could have been styled the *extremum auctumni*. The beginning of the winter on the other hand, properly so called, must have been the end of the autumn; and the beginning of winter, in the ordinary sense of the phrase at this period of antiquity, was that season of the natural year which coincided with the Πλειάδων δύσις; the cosmical setting of the Pleiads. We shall have occasion to shew that B. C. 47, when Julius Cæsar and the partizans of Pompey were warring with each other in the same part of Africa, the date of this natural phenomenon for those latitudes was reckoned to be about November 12 or 13: and it could not have been more than a day earlier, for the same latitude, B. C. 203. Let us assume then that Livy's *extremum auctumni* in this instance was reckoned from November 12. Ninety-two days before that date take us back to August 12; as the most probable date of the commencement of all these proceedings, that of the departure from Sicily.

If now we turn to our Roman calendar of this year we find that this date of August 12 that year was falling on September 15 Roman; and from September 15 Roman to October 31 Roman, there would be just 45 days. It was a rule of the military service among the Romans, that the soldiers should go on no expedition with less than half a month's supplies; Ferre plus dimidiati mensis cibaria[m]. Scipio was acting agreeably to this rule in the present instance; only, for the special reasons of the case, as he was preparing to invade Africa, he extended it to a month and a half, instead of half a month merely*. We thus account in a very natural man-

* It is observable (Livy xxix. 25) that, of these 45 days' provisions,

[m] Cicero, Tusculanæ, ii. 16, 37.

ner for his taking with him 45 days' supplies. They were intended to last from the middle of the month in which he was setting out (September Roman) to the end of the next, (October.) Moreover it appears from Livy that corn harvest was still going on in Africa, when he arrived[n]; and that might actually be the case on and after August 14. The moon too B. C. 203 was new on August 2; and therefore August 12, the date of the departure from Sicily, was the lunar eleventh; a very favourable time of the lunar month for setting out: when Scipio might calculate upon light by night as well as by day; and at the ordinary rate of the passage to Africa from Sicily, (three or four days and nights) might expect to reach his destination about the full of the moon.

The most remarkable coincidence however about these dates is *this;* that October 31 Roman this year, the 45th day from September 15 Roman, fell on September 26: and September 25 at this time was the date of the mean autumnal equinox for any meridian in Africa; September 27, or even, as it might be reckoned, September 26, was that of the true. It was most probably this coincidence which determined Scipio to take with him 45 days' supplies exactly; and which brought back his fleet a second time with fresh supplies apparently on the very day of the equinox itself, September 25 or 26. It is with the utmost propriety too that 47 days, reckoned from September 25 exclusive, might be supposed to have extended to the extremum auctumni November 11, reckoned inclusively.

We are of opinion therefore that the actual date of the departure from Sicily on this African expedition in all probability was xvi Kalendas Octobres* U. C. 551 Varr. August 12

15 days' provisions were *cocta:* that is already dressed ready for use. These were the dimidiati mensis cibaria properly so called: and it is a curious coincidence that, if he was setting sail on the 15th September Roman, they were calculated to last just one day more than half that month.

* It is observable too that, in fixing on this day for setting sail, Scipio was avoiding the dies postriduanus, xvii Kalendas Octobres, September 14

[n] xxix. 36.

B. C. 203; that of the landing in Africa was xiv Kalendas Octobres, August 14: the length of the first campaign in Africa was 92 days; and the date of the commencement of the blockade of Utica for the winter was xiv Kalendas Januarias, December 18 Roman, (December this year having 30 days, and not 29 merely,) November 12.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 7. 356 days.

U. C. 552 Varr. 551 Cap. 549 Polyb. B. C. 203–202.

Ti. Claudius Nero
M. Servilius (Pulex) Geminus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 25 B. C. 203. Nundinal Char. 4.

i. *On the chronology of the second year's campaign, that of* B. C. 202. *Date of the surprise of the camp of Syphax and of that of the Carthaginians.*

As the accounts of Polybius come in after the first year of the proceedings in Africa, we shall assume these as the text of our review of the chronology of those of the second year; or of such parts of them as are calculated to illustrate the calendar: making use of Livy's also, or of any others which are available for our purpose, along with them.

The first event of this second year was the attack made by Scipio by night on the camp of Syphax and that of Hasdrubal[o]. This attempt was preceded by negotiations between him and Syphax[p]: which led to no result but that of suggesting to Scipio the first idea of the attempt. Polybius dates the beginning of these negotiations while it was still the winter season[q]; the close, Ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν τῆς ἐαρινῆς ὥρας ὑπέφαινεν· ἤδη[r]: Livy too when Jam veris principium erat[s]. These intimations for such a climate as that of Carthage can scarcely be understood of a later time in the natural year

Roman; a day no doubt already proscribed as *ater* and *religiosus* for any such enterprize as this, whether either of the other two *dies postriduani* yet was so or not. See Diss. v. ch. iii. sect. iv. i. 480.

[o] Polybius, xiv. 1–5. 6. Livy, xxx. 3–6. 7. Appian, viii. 17–24. Cf. Zonaras, ix. 12. 438 C—13. 441 B. Silius Italicus, xvii. 83–92: 175–178. Florus, ii. 6. § 56. Frontinus, i. ii. 1: ii. v. 29. Orosius, iv. 18.

[p] Polybius, xiv. 1, 1–6. Livy, xxx. 3. Appian, viii. 17. Dio, Fragm. lxv.

[q] xiv. 1. § 2–15. Cf. 6. § 7.

[r] Ibid. 2. § 1.

[s] xxx. 4.

than the beginning of March: though Livy himself calls the quarters of the Carthaginians at this very time their hibernacula[t]; as if it was still winter in Africa.

Now the camps of the Carthaginians and of Syphax respectively were ten stades asunder from each other, and sixty stades distant from the lines of Scipio[u]. The most significant circumstance in the account of the attempt is consequently *this*; That having this distance to march Scipio set out Ἀρτι ληγούσης τῆς πρώτης φυλακῆς[w], or, as Livy describes the time, Ad primam ferme vigiliam[x]; and so proportioned the rate of his march as to arrive at his destination Περὶ τὴν τρίτην φυλακὴν λήγουσαν, or according to Livy, Media nocte: having consequently spent six hours on the road, and marched at the rate of one of our miles an hour. It is clear that he had an object in view in so doing; and that could be nothing except that so he might reach the enemy's camp at a certain time, and not before it. It appears further that from the time of his arrival there the night was dark[y]; but not sooner.

Now if we may assume that this attempt was made soon after the beginning of March; the date of the true vernal equinox at this time being March 25, soon after midnight, the first watch of the night would expire about 8.30 P. M. of our time, and the third about 2.30 A. M. As the moon, at 7 or 8 days old, sets about midnight; at 9 or 10 days old it commonly sets about two hours after midnight. We may perceive then in these circumstances a very significant intimation that the time chosen by Scipio for this attempt must have been when there was a moon nine or ten days old; which would give light until after midnight for a march of this kind, but might be expected to set towards the end of the third watch of the night, when Scipio proposed to come upon the enemy*.

* In the circumstances of this attempt of Scipio's B. C. 202, there is a remarkable resemblance to those which are recorded of Aratus' on Sicyon, B. C. 251: which we may some time or other have occasion to explain in illustration of the Sicyonian calendar. That attempt was made on the

[t] xxx. 3, 4: cf. Appian, viii. 26. He too dates the attempt in the winter; but the same winter as that of the siege of Utica: cf. 16.

[u] Polybius, xiv. 4. § 1: 1. § 14.

[w] Ibid. 3. § 5: 4. § 1, 2, 3.

[x] xxx. 5. Cf. Appian, viii. 21.

[y] Polybius, xiv. 4. § 3. Livy, loc. cit. Appian, loc. cit.

The principal moon of this year, B. C. 202, Period xiii. Cycle ix. 3 of our General Lunar Tables, fell on March 26 at midnight: and that is confirmed by the solar eclipse, at the next new moon, April 25, 7.30 P. M. Paris. The moon of February consequently must have fallen Feb. 24 or 25 at midnight: and the ninth lunar day of that moon would be beginning or complete March 5 at midnight. We are entirely of opinion that this was the moon which Scipio fixed upon for his purpose. He set out consequently on the night of March 4, between 8 and 9 P. M.; and arrived at the enemy's camp and succeeded in his object to the utmost of his wish between 2 and 3 in the morning of March 5.

The first confirmation of this date may be derived from the Punic calendar of the time being, if we are only aware that there was one day in that calendar *infamous* for national calamities and misfortunes, especially in war; the 22nd of the month[z]. The Punic Thoth at this time was to be reckoned from the 3rd of the Thoth of Nabonassar[a]: and it bore date in this year October 15 B. C. 203 Nab. 546. The Punic Tybi consequently bore date February 12 B. C. 202; and the 22nd of that month was March 5 at midnight: the very day on which Scipio executed his design on the Punic encampments.

ii. *On the date of the capture of Syphax.*

The next confirmation of the above conclusion is the date of the defeat of Syphax by Lælius and Masinissa, when he himself was made prisoner. We apprehend that this was the event to which Ovid alluded in the first of the two lines, quoted supra[b]:

Postera lux melior: superat Masinissa Syphacem—

and if so, its date must have been the Roman June 23, which coincided this year with the Julian May 14. Between May 14 and March 5 there would be an interval of 70 days com-

lunar 9th, which coincided that year with Feb. 5-6; and Aratus then too came on the city at the same time of the morning, and just as the moon was setting.

[z] See supra, note, p. 44.

[a] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, vol. i. 672.

[b] Page 40.

plete: and we have to consider in what manner that must have been, or might have been, filled up.

In the first place both Polybius and Livy[c] concur to imply that the deliberations at Carthage, about the prosecution of the war, after the recent misfortune, could not have begun until the next day, March 6. For the collection of a fresh army Polybius[d] allows 30 days, March 6 to April 5; and during that time Scipio was prosecuting the siege of Utica[e]. This army when formed encamped in the Μεγάλα πεδία[d]: and as these were five days' march from Utica[f], it would require five days to carry the news of its being assembled there (the Fama redintegrati belli as Livy terms it[e]) to Utica; and five days more to march thither from Utica: ten days in all, April 6—15.

On the fifth day after the arrival of the Romans, (April 20,) according to Polybius[g], the battle was fought in which the Carthaginians were again defeated; Hasdrubal escaping to Carthage, Syphax to his own country*. In the Punic calendar April 20 corresponded to the 8th of Phamenoth.

The mission of Lælius and Masinissa in pursuit of Syphax after this battle is mentioned by Polybius also[h]; but here his accounts break off. Livy however continues them; dating the mission the day after the battle[i], April 21; and their arrival in Numidia, (which means at Cirta[k],) on the 15th day after[i]: and that would imply that Cirta was 204 Roman miles at least distant from the Magni Campi at the rate of 14 miles a day. These different notes of time extend down to May 5; that is, within nine days only of Ovid's date of the last and decisive battle, in which Syphax was made prisoner, May 14. This is the next thing related by Livy[k]: and though he does not say how long it was after the

* Livy dates this battle as if on the fifth day after the Romans set out from Utica, not the fifth after their arrival at the Magni Campi. If he took his accounts from Polybius this does not speak well for the exactness with which he must have copied him.

[c] Polybius, xiv. 6. § 1–12. Livy, xxx. 7. Appian, viii. 24.
[d] Polybius, xiv. 6, 13: 7. § 8–9.
[e] Ibid. 8. § 1. Livy, xxx. 8.
[f] Polybius, xiv. 8. § 2.
[g] Ibid. 8. § 2–4. 14: cf. 9. § 6. Livy, xxx. 8.
[h] xiv. 9. § 2. 3.
[i] xxx. 9. 11. Appian, viii. 26.
[k] xxx. 11. 12. Cf. Applan, viii. 27. 106. Dio, Fragm. lxvi. Masinissa in this battle himself made Syphax prisoner. Hence Ovid's

Superat Masinissa Syphacem.

arrival of Lælius and Masinissa at Cirta, every one must allow that it might have been nine days; and that there is nothing any where on record to impeach the credibility of the traditionary date of this victory, consigned to the Roman calendar at the time and handed down by Ovid. Its date in the Punic calendar would be the second of Pharmuthi.

iii. *On the chronology of the rest of the campaign of B. C. 202, down to the battle of Zama.*

With regard to the intermediate events from May 14 to October 19, (the date of the battle of Zama,) we shall probably best be able to fix the chronological position of each, if we trace them not forwards from May 14, (though that might be considered a well ascertained date,) but backwards from October 19, which is a still more certain point of time.

Now, if the date of the battle of Zama was October 19, that of the conference between Hannibal and Scipio, (which it is agreed[l] preceded the battle by one day only,) must have been October 18: that of the arrival of Masinissa at the camp of Scipio the day before this must have been October 17: that of the mission of the spies, said to have been sent by Hannibal to the camp of the Romans, and afterwards that of the herald to propose the conference, must have been the day before, October 16, if both took place on the same day; or rather as we apprehend to have been more truly the case, that of the herald was October 16, and that of the spies was October 15[m]: and we should thus have four successive days before the battle, October 15 to October 18; distinctly ascertained by all our authorities.

At this point of time however, viz. that which precedes the mission of these spies, a very important fact is mentioned by Appian[m]; viz. that before the commission of hostilities on either side Hannibal sent word to Scipio of the Ἀνοχῶν λύσις: i. e. that some truce or induciæ was at an end; the first thing done by him after this notification being to send the spies. In this statement indeed Appian stands alone; but that cir-

[l] Polybius, xv. 6. § 3–9. § 2. Livy, xxx. 29–32. Cf. Appian, viii. 39. 40. Cornelius Nepos, Hannibal, vi. § 2.

[m] Polybius, xv. 5. § 3–12. Livy, xxx. 29. Appian, viii. 39. Eutropius, iii. 13. Valerius Max. iii. vii. 1 De Fiducia sui.

cumstance merely is not sufficient to discredit it. And though the context of *his* accounts[n] would imply that this was a truce, concluded with Scipio since the arrival of Hannibal at Zama[o] through the intervention of Masinissa; there is no authority for the supposition of any such truce either in the fragments of Polybius, or in the fuller and more circumstantial accounts of Livy, which were no doubt taken in a great measure from Polybius also*.

The truth is that these were the Ἀνοχαὶ granted for a certain length of time to the Carthaginians at their own request, after the capture of Syphax; in order that they might send an embassy to Rome to treat for peace: as Appian himself relates[p]. There is no other truce on record before the battle of Zama; and this was not yet at an end when Hannibal himself arrived in Africa from Italy. It is agreed that it was the accession of confidence inspired by his arrival which determined the Carthaginians to resume hostilities before the expiration of the truce; as they did by the attack on the Roman corn ships[q]: and it was still nominally continuing when the Carthaginian ambassadors returning from Rome with Lælius came into the hands of Scipio at Utica[r].

It seems to us therefore that without calling in question the fact that Hannibal, just before the battle of Zama, sent

* Appian's account of the last two years of the second Punic war cannot be depended on. He has confounded the events of distinct years[1]. He supposes a double embassy from Carthage to Rome, before the return of Hannibal to Africa[2]; for the second of which there is no other authority. And what is more he even supposes that peace had been made in consequence of the mission of the first of these embassies, before the return of Hannibal; and that the second embassy was sent to Rome to have it confirmed by oath there on the part of the consuls, before the arrival of Hannibal in Africa also: and that this was abruptly ordered away from Rome, only after the news arrived of the breach of the recent agreement of peace by the Carthaginians[3]; for none of which representations does any foundation appear in Polybius, or in Livy.

1 viii. 26. 16. 2 viii. 31–33. 3 viii. 34–35.

n viii. 31–39. o Ibid. 36.
p Ibid. 31. 26–28.
q Polybius, xv. 1. 2. 8. § 8–9. 17, 3. 18. § 3. Livy, xxx. 24. Appian, viii. 34.
r Polybius, xv. 4. § 5. Livy, xxxi. 25. 37. Appian, viii. 35. Dio, Fragm. cliv. Eutropius, iii. 12. Valerius Max. vi. 4 De Fide. Diodorus, Fragm. lib. xxvii.

word to Scipio of the expiration of some truce, (though it rests entirely on the authority of Appian,) it may be explained consistently with the real nature and actual course of events before and after this battle, by understanding this truce of that which had been conceded to the Carthaginians for the sake of sending the embassy to Rome; which embassy too at this very time had only just returned. And since it appears that this notice was given the day before the mission of the spies; if the spies were sent on October 15, the notice must have been given on the 14th: and therefore the truce must have expired on the 14th.

Now the conclusion respecting the date of its expiration thus obtained is strikingly confirmed by the testimony of the Punic calendar of the time being. The first of the Punic Thoth Nab. 547 was October 15 B. C. 202; and consequently the last day of the truce, October 14, was the last day of the Punic year. The length of this truce is specified by Eutropius only[s]; and it appears from him that it was for 45 days, one month and one half of equable time exactly: which, it must be allowed, is a very critical coincidence, and does much to authorize the inference that it was actually concluded 45 days before the end of the current Punic year, October 14; and therefore on August 31st the 21st of the Punic Epiphi. If we look at these Julian dates in the Roman calendar for the time being, we find August 31 falling on Pridie Idus Octobres, and October 14 on iv Kalendas Decembres, November 27 Roman: in neither of which is any such remarkable coincidence discoverable as that which has just been pointed out in the Punic calendar of the time being; in which the first of these dates fell on the 21st of the last month but one, and the second on the last day of the current year itself*.

* It is not surprising to find terms or intervals of this kind, measured by months, reckoned in the calendar of Carthage, rather than in that of Rome; especially as the Carthaginians were so much more concerned in them than the Romans. On the next occasion of the same kind (after Zama) a τρίμηνον, or term of three months, was granted for the same purpose[l]: and in the course of the subsequent negotiations, an interval of 30

l Polybius, xv. 18. § 6. Cf. Livy, xxx. 37. 38.

s iii. 12.

The date of this truce then having been August 31, and that of the defeat and capture of Syphax previously having been May 14; the intermediate events must have taken up the term of 109 days. What these were we do not know with sufficient exactness to be enabled to pronounce concerning them whether they were competent to have filled up that interval or not. If Cirta was 15 days' journey distant from the Μεγάλα πεδία, it was 20 days' journey distant from Utica; and it would require that length of time at least to send Syphax from Cirta to Utica[t]. To say nothing of the delay interposed by the marriage of Masinissa to Sophonisba[u]; the reduction of the cities of Numidia by him and Lælius[w] would take up more or less time: and it might very possibly have taken up the greater part of the interval in question. Their return to Utica after this would require another 20 days; and if, as Appian informs us[x], when Masinissa himself returned to Utica Sophonisba was left at Cirta; the sequel of her tragical story from beginning to end might require another forty days for its transaction[y]. On the whole it is far from improbable that three months at least might actually have elapsed before Lælius was sent with Syphax to Rome[z]; before which there is no mention even in Livy of any application of the Carthaginians to Scipio about the truce[a], or of the mission of any embassy of theirs to Rome to treat for peace. We read in him[b] of three days granted to the Carthaginians, to consider upon the ultimatum of Scipio; which being understood of one day for returning from Utica to Carthage, one day for deliberation at Carthage, and one day

days, of 60 days, of 150 days[2], respectively, for such and such purposes connected with these proceedings, is also mentioned. All these are measures of integral noctidiurnal in integral menstrual time, by the equable calendar; but not by the Roman: and they very plainly imply that the calendar by which they were reckoned must have been the equable one; as the Punic calendar was at this time.

[2] Appian, viii. 54.

[t] Livy, xxx. 13. Appian, viii. 26. 28. Dio, Fragm. lxvi.
[u] Livy, xxx. 12. 14. 15.
[w] Ibid. 12. Appian, viii. 27.
[x] viii. 27. 28.
[y] Polybius, xiv. 10. Livy, xxx. 14. 15. 9–11.
[z] Livy, xxx. 16. Appian, viii. 28.
[a] Cf. xxx. 9. Polybius, xiv. 9. § 6–8.
[b] xxx. 16. Cf. Polybius, xv. 1. § 6. 7.

for coming back to Utica, will imply that their application about the truce was made on or just before August 28, the 106th day from May 14; and that these three days were August 29, August 30, and August 31, respectively, Epiphi 19, 20, and 21 in their own calendar.

Livy adds that deputies were sent by them to ratify the truce with Scipio, and ambassadors to Rome to treat for peace, at one and the same time[b]; but it is more probable that the same persons were sent by them first to Scipio for one of these purposes and then to Rome for the other: since it appears that their ambassadors to Rome at last were accompanied by a legate of Scipio's also, Q. Fulvius Gillo[c]. This embassy therefore must have been sent at the beginning of September: and therefore it would not arrive in Italy before the middle of that month. Lælius with his prisoner Syphax had been come says Livy[d] Multis ante diebus: and if he was despatched from Africa before the middle of August that could not fail to be the case. He had even completed his business at Rome, and was already on his way back to Africa, when the arrival of the embassy at Puteoli caused him to be recalled. And we have seen that he returned with these ambassadors himself at last[e].

The mission of this embassy then must have taken place in September; and its return in October. It was during its absence that the Carthaginians committed the outrage on the Roman convoy under Octavius; bound from Sicily to Africa, with supplies for the army, and driven on shore at Ægimurum 30 miles from Carthage[f]. Consequently in September; but probably towards the very end of the month. Diodorus implies[g] that this convoy was despatched from Sicily after corn-harvest; and that could not fail to be over there by the middle of September. It is observable that it set sail with an *east* wind; and was driven on shore by a change from the east to the south-west (Africus): which may be an argument of a time of the year later than the cessation of the

[b] Livy, xxx. 16. Cf. Polybius, xv. 1. § 6, 7.

[c] Livy, xxx. 21. 25. Cf. Eutropius, iii. 12.

[d] Livy, xxx. 17. [e] Ibid. 25.

[f] Ibid. 24. Polybius, xv. 1.

[g] SS. Vat. ii. 62. Diodorus, xxvi—xxx. cap. v.

Etesian winds, which the ancients commonly date at the beginning of September.

With regard to the movements of Hannibal; it is clear from Polybius[h] that he had already returned to Africa and, as it would seem, was even already at Adrumetum[i] when this act of aggression was committed. It appears also from Livy[k] that the time of his departure from Italy must have coincided with that of the arrival of the Carthaginian ambassadors at Puteoli; so much so that the news of the former event had already reached Rome before the embassy had actually come to Puteoli (five days' journey distant from Rome): and it was this very fact of Hannibal's being already gone from Italy before their arrival[k] which occasioned the failure of the object of their mission, and induced the senate to send them back Re infecta[k]. That Hannibal therefore must have left Italy in September, if the Carthaginian embassy arrived there in the same month, may be taken for granted.

There is certainly some difficulty with respect to his subsequent movements in Africa. It would appear from Polybius and Appian[l] (though the fact is not necessarily to be inferred from the accounts of Polybius), as if he landed first of all at Adrumetum, and marched from Adrumetum directly to Zama; which both Polybius and Livy[l] suppose to have been five days' journey distant from Carthage, and the maps shew to have been not more than 63 Roman miles direct from Adrumetum. Yet Livy in particular speaks of his marching to this locality even from Adrumetum *magnis itineribus*[l]; and that would imply not only a forced march but one of *several* days' duration: and both Polybius, Livy, Cornelius Nepos[m], and Appian[n] concur in stating that after the battle he rode back to the same quarter from which he had come to Zama (Adrumetum); and, according to the latter, a distance of 300 Roman miles, or 3000 stades, in two days and two nights: and they mention this as a well at-

[h] xv. 1–6. [i] Ibid. v. § 3.
[k] xxx. 21, 22, 23. Cf. Dio, cliii. 14, 15. Zonaras, ix. 13. 440 D.
[l] Polybius, xv. 5. § 3. (Cf. Livy, xxx. 29.) Appian, viii. 33.
[m] Polybius, xv. 15. § 3. Livy, xxx. 35. Cornelius Nepos, Vita, vi. § 2.
[n] viii. 47.

tested fact, and yet as an almost incredible instance of despatch.

On this supposition however, he must really have marched to Zama from some quarter, which was much further off from it than Adrumetum, even though on his way to Zama he had come to Adrumetum before the battle, and even though he returned to Adrumetum after the battle; both which facts appear to be placed out of question by the testimony of Polybius. It is not possible to explain his statements and those of Cornelius Nepos and Appian consistently with one another, except by supposing that Hannibal actually landed in Africa not at Adrumetum, where he would have been only four or five days' march from Zama, but somewhere else, 300 Roman miles, and twenty marches at least, even at the rate of 15 miles a day, distant from that locality *. And on this

* With regard to the statement that Hannibal, on his return to Africa, landed first at Adrumetum, it is not to be found in so many words in Polybius [1]. In fact it appears from Livy, and from Orosius [2] after Livy, that he landed first at Leptis [2]. There were two places in Africa of that name; Leptis Major and Leptis Minor [3]. Leptis Minor was close to Adrumetum. Leptis Major was more than 350 Roman miles direct lower down the coast to the south-east; not far from the head of the Syrtis Major. There would be just the same objection to the supposition of Hannibal's having landed at the Leptis Minor as at Adrumetum. But as to the Leptis Major, or some locality near to that; it would be exactly such as the necessity of the case seems to require, if Hannibal must have landed somewhere 300 Roman miles, if not 3000 Greek stades, distant from Zama. And he might march thence in the first place to Adrumetum, and from Adrumetum to Zama: for that he *did* come from Adrumetum direct to Zama seems to be well attested. Polybius is express [1] to that point.

On this question of the true site of Hannibal's landing place; the story which is on record of his treatment of his pilot while he was on his way, through mistake of some kind, is to be taken into account. This pilot's name is said to have been Pelorus; and it is even stated that the promontory of Pelorum in Sicily was so called after him: as if Hannibal, on discovering his error, had buried him there, or erected some monument to his memory there [4]. Now it is agreed that he set sail from Bruttium in

1 xv. 5. § 3.

2 Livy, xxx. 25. Orosius, iv. 19.

3 Pliny, H. N. v. 3. 282: 4. 286. Cf. Sallust, De Bello Jug. xxii: lxxix: lxxx. Strabo, xvii. 3.

4 Valerius Maximus, ix. viii. 1 De Temeritate, Externa. Pomponius Mela, ii 7. p. 61. Sallust, Fragm. Lib. Inc. xxiv. Tom. ii. 147. Servius, ad Æneid. iii. 44. 687.

principle, if he was already at Zama on October 14; he could not have set out on this march later than September 24: and if Livy is right in stating also that, wheresoever he first landed in Africa, he stayed a few days there, to refresh his men after the fatigue of the voyage from Italy[o], we may even assume that he could not have landed later than September 18 or 19; nor consequently have left Italy much later than September 10. For the passage itself howsoever expeditiously made would require not less than five or six days.

The actual time of his departure from Italy, on these suppositions, would be sometime about the 10th of September; and that of his arrival in Africa sometime before the 20th of that month. The news of his departure therefore might have been only just received at Rome about the middle of September, when the embassy from Carthage also would be arriving in Italy: and yet the news of his landing in Africa might reach Carthage early in October; at the very time to which their attack on the Roman fleet, encouraged by the news of this return itself, has been already determined. And the tidings of each of these events, or of what Livy calls the rebellion of the Carthaginians in particular, might be received at Rome at the time which he supposes; viz. when the eclipse also, observed at Cumæ, was announced at Rome[p]. For that was the eclipse of Zama itself, that of October 19; and it would require five or six days to carry the news of it from Cumæ to Rome: by which time (October 24) an event which had happened in Africa at the beginning of the month, and of which the Romans were interested in being made aware with all possible despatch, could not fail to be already known at Rome.

It is a further argument of the lunar date of Zama that,

Italy: the authorities in question say from the city Petelia. We have then only to look into the maps to see that the direct course from that quarter across the sea to Africa would be to the Leptis Major. Nor have we any doubt that this Leptis was the point for which Hannibal made in the first instance; though he might actually land somewhere between it and the Syrtis Minor, considerably nearer to Adrumetum, and where he might be not more than 300 Roman miles distant from Zama.

[o] XXX. 29. [p] Ibid. 38.

according to Appian[q], Hannibal escaped from the field under cover of night. The night would necessarily be dark soon after sunset on the day of an eclipse of the sun.

iv. *On the chronology of events, after the battle of Zama, to the end of the same consular year.*

The first thing done by Scipio after his victory was to burn the spoils[r]: and as the battle had lasted until night that could not be done before the next day, October 20 Julian December 4 Roman.

After this Livy takes him directly back to Utica; but only because he had heard meanwhile of the arrival there of the Roman convoy under P. Lentulus[r]. Now Zama was five days' journey from Carthage[s] and something more from Utica. So that he might not hear at Zama of the arrival of the fleet at Utica before October 25 Julian, December 9 Roman, nor be returned himself to Utica before October 30 Julian December 14 Roman.

From Utica he sent Lælius to Rome with the tidings of his victory: and that might be done on October 30 December 14 itself. He then moved upon Carthage, himself by sea with the fleet, Octavius by land with the army: and that could not have been done before October 31 December 15. Now Utica was more than one day's march from Carthage: and as the army came upon this occasion within view of the walls of Carthage, while the fleet advanced as far as the port itself; it would require two days, October 31 and November 1 Julian, December 15 and 16 Roman, to go on this expedition and to return to Utica.

From Utica as soon as he had returned thither he was proceeding to Tunis, (where he had told the Carthaginians they were to expect his answer,) when he encountered Vermina the son of Syphax[t] by the way. So that the date of this second battle and second victory could not have been earlier than November 2 Julian, December 17 Roman, the stated date at this time of the Saturnalia Prima; just 14 days after the day of Zama; as we before determined it to have been[u].

[q] viii. 47.
[r] Appian, viii. 48: cf. Livy, xxx. 36.
[s] Polybius, xv. 5. §. 3. Livy, xxx. 29. Appian, viii. 75.
[t] Livy, xxx. 36: cf. Appian, viii. 33.
[u] Vol. i. 450 sqq.

SECTION III.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 8.356 *days.*

U. C. 553 Varr. 552 Cap. 550. Polyb. B. C. 202–201.

Cn. Cornelius Lentulus.
P. Ailius Pætus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 16 B. C. 202. Nundinal Char. 8.

i. *Chronology of events to the end of the second Punic war.*

It follows that the renewal of the negotiations with the Carthaginians after this second victory could not have begun earlier than November 3 Julian December 18 Roman. When they were concluded, or how long they lasted meanwhile, does not appear.

Three months however at least[w] were granted to the Carthaginians, in order to go to Rome and to return thence. And as this was just twice the length of time which had been allowed for the same purpose on the former occasion, it is evident that these preliminary negotiations must have been protracted from November 3 (if they began on that day) into the *winter;* when twice as much time would be required for a voyage from Africa to Italy and back again as in the summer season. It appears too that the Carthaginian embassy, despatched by virtue of this agreement, had not yet arrived at Rome Pridie Idus Martias, the official ingress of U. C. 553, B. C. 202–201[x] *: and yet that they must actually have arrived soon after[y], accompanied too by a legate of Scipio's, L. Veturius Philo[z], who brought with him the news of his last victory, that over Vermina, also[y]. Now the Ides of March, U. C. 553, fell on January 26 B. C. 201. The first of the Punic Thoth Nab. 547 falling October 15 B. C. 202, the first of the Punic Athyr would fall December 14; and the first of the Punic Chœac January 13 B. C. 201. The embassy had not arrived on the 15th of March Roman, January 26 B. C. 201, 13 days after the first of Chœac; but they must have arrived

* Appian indeed, viii. 56. 62, supposes the Consul, Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, to have been already in office when Scipio granted terms to the Carthaginians after Zama.

[w] Livy, xxx. 38: cf. Polybius, xv. 18. §. 6. [x] Ibid. 39. [y] Ibid. 40. [z] Ibid. 38.

soon after that day. If then these three months were dated expressly from the first day of some month in their own calendar, as is most probable, it must have been from the first of Athyr, December 14. The first of Chœac, January 13, must have been too near to the actual date of their arrival soon after January 26. It is to be considered that, from the necessity of the case, this embassy would have both to go and to return in the winter: and they would naturally calculate beforehand the length of time which would be requisite both for the voyage and for the transaction of their business at Rome. By stipulating for three months, bearing date from the first of the Punic Athyr, December 14, they might reckon on having the first of the winter months for their voyage to Italy, and the first of the spring months for their return home; and the intermediate month (the severest part of the winter) for the transaction of their business at Rome. And though they might have been later in arriving at Rome than they had calculated; it is clear that even on this principle they arrived critically at such a time as to be able to get the object of their mission completed between the first half of the Punic Chœac January 28 B. C. 201, and the last half of the Punic Tybi February 27; and yet so as to have two or three weeks clear for their return.

We may confirm these conclusions in the last place by the fact which we learn from Appian [a], That when these Inducię were granted to the Carthaginians by Scipio it was stipulated between them that within 150 days of the conclusion of peace the Romans should evacuate Libya. This number of days is an exact measure of five equable months: and if we may only assume that they were intended as an extension or continuation of the term of three months, previously conceded for the negotiation of the peace; we have nothing to do but to reckon *eight* months of equable time, or 240 days, from the first of the Punic Athyr Nab. 547 December 14 B. C. 202, and we shall very probably come to the date of the actual evacuation of Libya by the Romans, and consequently of the return of Scipio [b], the first of the Punic Epi-

[a] viii. 54. [b] Polybius, xvi. 23. Livy, xxx. 45. Appian, viii. 65, 66. Orosius, iv. 19.

phi Nab. 547, August 10 B. C. 201. This return could not long have preceded his triumph; the fact of the celebration of which is known, but the date has been lost out of the Fasti. And it would be a singular coincidence thus brought to light; viz. that the Romans should have first landed in Africa August 14 B. C. 203, and have finally quitted it again August 10 B. C. 201, only four days before the same day in that year too.

There can be little doubt at least, in our opinion, that the close of these proceedings, both in Africa and in Italy, must have fallen out some time in the month of August B. C. 201. It is agreed that the consuls under whom the war was brought to an end were those of U. C. 553 Varr. Cn. Cornelius Lentulus and P. Ælius Pætus, B. C. 202–201 [c]. And that the end of the war itself is not to be dated from the battle of Zama, or from the induciæ granted to the Carthaginians, but from the final evacuation of Libya, may be inferred both from the fact reported of the year of these consuls by Pliny[c], and from what Cornelius Nepos tells us [c]; viz. that, when the Carthaginians sent another embassy to Rome, to return thanks for this final pacific settlement of affairs between them, the consuls in office were Publius Sulpicius Galba and Caius Aurelius Cotta, those of U. C. 554 Varr. B. C. 201–200. This embassy would not be sent until Libya had been evacuated. We hope to make it appear by-and-by that these consuls entered *before* the Ides of March U. C. 554; i. e. before January 16 B. C. 200. Consequently the embassy was most probably sent in the autumnal quarter, B. C. 201 [d].

SECTION IV.—*Chronological summary of the principal events of the two campaigns in Africa,* B. C. 203 *and* 202; *the* 16*th and the* 17*th years of the second Punic war.*

i. August 12 Julian, Sept. 15 Roman, Epiphi 2, B. C. 203
Scipio sets sail from Sicily.

---

ii. August 14 Julian, Sept. 17 Roman, Epiphi 4,
Scipio lands in Africa.

---

[c] Livy, xxx. 44. Appian, viii. 56. 62: cf. Pliny, H. N. xviii. 46. 151, 152. Cornelius Nepos, Hannibal, vii. §. 1.

[d] Compare Livy, xxxi. 11: 19 xxx. 44: 45.

iii. September 26 Julian, October 31 Roman, Mesore 17,
Expedition of seven days into the interior of Africa.

iv. October 3 Julian, Nov. 7 Roman, Mesore 24,
Formation of the siege of Utica.

v. November 12 Julian, December 18 Roman, Thoth 29,
Arrival of Syphax at Utica. Close of the campaign of B. C. 203.

Second year of Scipio in Africa.

Belli Punici xvii. B. C. 202.

i. March 5 Julian, April 13 Roman, Tybi 22,
Scipio burns the camp of Syphax and of Hasdrubal.

ii. April 20 Julian, May 30 Roman, Phamenoth 8,
Defeat of Syphax and Hasdrubal in the Magni Campi.

iii. May 14 Julian, June 23 Roman, Pharmuthi 2,
Defeat and capture of Syphax by Masinissa and Lælius.

iv. August 31 Julian, October 14 Roman, Epiphi 21,
Truce of 45 days. Mission of the first Carthaginian embassy to Rome.

v. October 14 Julian, November 27 Roman, Epagomenè 5,
Expiration of the truce.

vi. October 19 Julian, December 3 Roman, Thoth 5,
Battle of Zama.

vii. November 2 Julian, December 17 Roman, Thoth 19,
Defeat of Vermina.

viii. December 14 Julian, January 29 Roman, Athyr 1,
Second truce of three months or 90 days. Mission of the second Carthaginian embassy to Rome.

B. C. 201.

ix. August 10 Julian, October 3 Roman, Epiphi 1,
Evacuation of Africa and return of Scipio.

CHAPTER IV.

On the Chronology of the first year of the war with Philip.

SECTION I.—*Reasons for entering on the consideration of this question.*

The end of the second Punic war was followed by the beginning of the second Macedonian war[e]; if indeed the war with Philip, first begun U.C. 539 B.C. 215[f] or the next years, could be said to have ever after been concluded, even by the pacification entered into apparently U.C. 550 B.C. 204[h].

The consular year however of P. Sulpicius and C. Aurelius may be considered the first of a second war of this denomination. After having dwelt so long on the chronology of the last two or three years of the second Punic war; we should not perhaps have considered ourselves at liberty to enter on the particular examination of any more years at this period of Roman history, had there not been the same reason to complain of the inaccuracy of Livy's accounts of the first proceedings in this Macedonian war as of the last in the second Punic war; had he not here also confounded the events of different years, without seeming to have been aware of any distinction between them: and, what is more, had not his statements at first sight appeared to be at variance with what must have been collected from the testimony of our own calendar. For this latter reason more especially we feel it to be incumbent upon us to consider his accounts of these things with attention; in the hope not only of rectifying the confusion in which they are more or less involved at present, but also of confirming the truth of our own calendar, and of demonstrating, by means of a case in point, what kind of service it is calculated to render in ascertaining the true order of contemporary events.

[e] Livy, xxxi. 1, 2. [f] Ibid. xxiii. 30. 33, 34. 38. Polybius, vii. 9.
[g] Ibid. xxiv. 9. [h] xxxix. 11—13: xxxi. 1.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 9. 356 days.

U. C. 554 Varr. 553 Cap. 551 Polyb. B. C. 201–200.

P. Sulpicius Galba Maximus ii
C. Aurelius Cotta.

Kalendæ Januariæ November 6 B. C. 201. Nundinal Char. 4.

i. *Statement of the difficulty connected with this question.*

We shall begin with explaining in brief the nature of the inconsistency between the statements of Livy and the testimony of our calendar, to which we have alluded.

The consular ingress of this year, U. C. 554 Varr., according to rule at this time, no doubt, should have been dated on the Ides of March: and Livy would imply that the year of Sulpicius and Aurelius did actually enter on the Ides of March[i]. If so, on January 16 B. C. 200, according to our calendar: and so far there is no appearance of any inconsistency between him and it.

But he gives us to understand further[k] that even after the ingress war with Philip had yet to be formally declared both by the senate and by the people; the consular levies for the service in Macedonia had still to be raised: in short all the preparations both by land and by sea, which such a war required, had still to be made. It follows that, whatsoever degree of despatch might have been used for these various purposes, the Consul Sulpicius could not have set out to Brundisium, much less have arrived in his province[l], (which means at Apollonia[m] on the opposite coast of Illyricum,) before the end of January, or even the middle or the end of February, B. C. 200. In any case it must follow that either he set out for his province in the winter, or he arrived in it in the spring. And yet we are told[l] that he accomplished the passage from Brundisium in *two* days, which shews that the season of the year must have been favourable for it; and that he came into his province (i. e. arrived at Apollonia[n]) Auctumno ferme exacto: late in the autumnal quarter indeed, but certainly not in the winter, much less in the spring. It appears too that after this he actually wintered

[i] xxxi. 5. [k] 5—8. [l] 14. [m] 18. 22—27. [n] 22.

at Apollonia[o]; and actually moved from his quarters there first only at the beginning of the ensuing spring[p]: and when the campaign was over for the year that he returned to *winter* in the same quarters, that is at Apollonia[q], from which he had set out in the spring.

Now this representation of the course of things would be consistent with itself, and would be both natural and probable, if the real state of the case was *this*, That he actually came into his province, not in the winter or in the spring of B. C. 200, but in the autumn of B. C. 201. It would be consistent also with the testimony of our calendar, if the official ingress of this consular year was not the Ides of March, nor consequently any time in January B. C. 200. As it is, both cannot be true; both the testimony of our calendar, which fixes the Ides of March of this consular year to January 16 B. C. 200, and this statement of Livy, that the consular year in question entered both on the Ides of March and not long before the end of the autumnal quarter also.

ii. *On the true date of the consular Ingress,* U. C. 554 B. C. 201–200.

It appears to us then that we have no alternative left except to call in question the correctness of this statement that the year of Sulpicius and Aurelius did actually enter on the Ides of March. Let us therefore examine what Livy himself has said in reference to that point.

Anno quingentesimo ab urbe condita (and here, at the very outset of his statement, there is either a very great oversight of his own, or a very great omission in his text as it stands at present, the true year of the city of which he was speaking, in his own æra, the Catonian, being U. C. 552 at least*,) P. Sulpicio Galba C. Aurelio consulibus bellum cum rege Philippo initum est paucis mensibus post pacem Carthaginiensibus datam. omnium primum eam rem Idibus Martiis, quo die tum consulatus inibatur, P. Sulpicius consul retulit[r].

The first observation which may be made on this statement

* The Epitome (Lib. xxxi.) has the 550th year. Ruperti also in the text has *quingentesimo*, but in his "Commentarius" *quingentesimo quinquagesimo*.

[o] xxxi. 22. 27. [p] 33. [q] 33—40 : 41—43. [r] xxxi. 5.

is That a war, which had not yet been formally decreed by January 16 B. C. 200, could not with propriety be said to have begun *paucis mensibus* post pacem Carthaginiensibus datam; if at least *that* peace had been concluded soon after January 26 B. C. 201, almost *twelve* months before. But to this objection it might be replied that possibly Livy intended these *few months* of the interval between *this* war with Philip and the final evacuation of Africa, at the end of the second Punic war, August 10 B. C. 201. We shall not therefore insist upon it.

In the next place however we may observe That, had the sentence which follows stood thus: Omnium primum eam rem *Idibus Martiis* P. Sulpicius consul retulit—it might have been supposed that this statement was made *historically*: i. e. that Livy had found it on record that a motion concerning this war was made by the consul of the year, Sulpicius, on the first day of his year, the Ides of March. But, qualified as it is by a remark of his own, *quo die tum consulatus inibatur*, in our opinion, it fairly authorizes the inference that it was not made *historically*; that Livy did not find *any such motion* on *any such day* actually on record: nothing at the utmost except that such a motion was made by the consul of the year on the first day of his entering upon office; which day Livy himself took to mean the Ides of March, because the Ides of March had long been the regular date of the official ingress, and were so still.

Nor can it be said that, in the absence of any further explanation in the records of the times, or known to himself, Livy was to blame for this construction of the day in question. The general rule had long been, and was so still at this period of his history, that the consular years should bear date from the Ides of March. There is no rule of this kind however which must not sometimes allow of exceptions, and submit to be modified by circumstances. We saw repeated proofs of that fact[s] when the date of the ingress was the Kalends of January and when it was the Ides of December: and it is just as possible *a priori* that there might, or rather that sometimes there must, have been similar exceptions to the rule, when the ingress was the Ides of March. It is no objection

[s] Supra, Diss. ix.

that none such are actually on record from B. C. 280, when we supposed this rule to have first come into force[s], down to the the present time. Roman history is nowhere more defective than for the interval between B. C. 280 and the beginning of the second Punic war, B. C. 218: in the course of which many such cases of exception might have occurred.

The history of the Republic however from the Regifuge downwards demonstrates that there was not a more usual or a more legitimate reason for anticipating the regular ingress in a particular instance than the expectation of a *new* war; a war too at a distance from Italy, and requiring operations by sea as well as by land: a war with a formidable enemy and still as good as untried, like Philip of Macedon, the enemy whom the Romans were now preparing to encounter, the inheritor of the fame and reputation of Alexander the Great; a war too the beginning of which under the circumstances of the case was falling out not long before the actual termination of a given official year. In a case like that nothing could have been more agreeable to the practice and precedent of all former times than to have issued the notification of the comitia in the usual style, adapted to such occasions and employed exclusively upon them, Consulibus subrogandis qui magistratum extemplo obciperent; and to have abridged the duration of the current consular year in order to anticipate the beginning, if not to enlarge the term, of the next. The date of these comitia therefore[t] might be that of the ingress also; and early enough B. C. 201 to allow time for every thing to have actually come to pass, which Livy supposes to have done so between the ingress of the year of Sulpicius and the end of the autumnal quarter.

We do not indeed know the actual date of these comitia. It is observable however that at or about the same time as these comitia[t] supplies of corn, no doubt of that year's growth, and previously sent by Scipio from Africa, are said to have been distributed among the people at a cheap rate; and that would be an argument of the month of September or October. It is also observable that the army had been already transported back from Africa before Sulpicius entered on office[u]; and that some of the soldiers enrolled for the

[s] Supra, Diss. ix. [t] Livy, xxxi. 4. [u] Ibid. 8. Cf. 14.

service in Macedonia and under him consisted of volunteers from this African army. That army as we have seen had actually returned home on or soon after August 10, in the consular year of the predecessors of Sulpicius, Cn. Cornelius Lentulus P. Ælius Pætus[w]. It might be inferred from these facts that Sulpicius was already in office if not at the time of the triumph of Scipio, yet very soon after: in which case much would be done towards the removal of all further difficulty on this question. Sulpicius might be already elected, already in office, and already prepared to take the field, before the end of the autumnal quarter this very year, B. C. 201; as Livy gives us to understand he must actually have been.

iii. *On the cause or motive of the war with Philip.*

The ostensible pretext on the part of the Romans for the renewal of this war with Philip was the acts of hostility which he had previously committed against the Athenians, their own allies[x]; though these hostile proceedings of his towards the Athenians had been provoked by an act of violence which they had done to some of the allies of Philip: i. e. the Acarnanians[y]. This too was the consequence of some profanation of the mysteries of which those Acarnanians were supposed to have been guilty; and which, though in reality the effect of ignorance or inadvertency, the Athenians had resented so deeply as to put its authors to death.

It would be in our power to shew from the testimony of the Attic calendar that these mysteries must have been those of B. C. 202; the date of which was September 9 that year. The Acarnanians resented this act of severity towards their countrymen, with little or no delay[y]; and *their* part was espoused by Philip, *that* of the Athenians by Attalus and the Rhodians. The irritation of the Acarnanians no doubt found vent in an hostile invasion of the Attic territory B. C. 202: and the complaints of the Athenians, of the violence which they were experiencing at the hands of the allies of Philip, must have been speedily brought to Rome.

This is confirmed by the fact that soon after the ingress

[w] Ibid. xxx. 45. Polybius, xvi. 23. § 1—7. [x] Livy, xxxi. 1. Cf. Florus, ii. 7. § 4. [y] Ibid. 14. Cf Epitome, xxxi.

even of the consular year of Cn. Cornelius and P. Ælius, U. C. 553 B. C. 202—201, mention is made of three legati[z], who had been already sent to Greece, and in consequence of complaints of this kind, complaints of violence done to the allies of the Republic, which allies must have been the Athenians, by Philip; of which three legati a M. Aurelius was one[a]. And we may judge of the time when he must have been despatched on this occasion, from the fact that he was still in Macedonia before the comitia of Sulpicius and Aurelius[b]; and letters were received from him, at Rome, after the ingress of their year[c]: i. e. as Livy supposes after the Ides of March, U. C. 554 B. C. 201—200. He must therefore have been sent to Greece, to inquire into the state of things on the spot, in the spring of B. C. 201.

It appears also that the Athenians had applied for aid not only to Attalus and the Rhodians but to Ptolemy (Epiphanes) too, the reigning king of Egypt; and that soon after the ingress of Sulpicius' year an embassy from Egypt, produced by this application, was present at Rome[d]: and that too is an argument that hostilities between the Athenians and Philip must have begun long before the end of B. C. 201. *This* fact however is placed out of question by an allusion of Livy's himself to a *nova legatio* of the Athenians[e]; the arrival of which he dates critically between the ingress of the year of Sulpicius, (the true time of which was in October B. C. 201, as we have concluded *,) and the declaration of war against

* Polybius, xvi. 24: *Φίλιππος ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ χειμῶνος ἤδη καταρχομένου καθ' ὃν Πόπλιος Σουλπίκιος ὕπατος κατεστάθη ἐν Ῥώμῃ . . . οὐδαμῶς ἐβούλετο παραχειμάζειν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν . . . ἠναγκάζετο δὲ κ',τ.λ.* This refers to a point of time later than the events, related xvi. 2—9. 11—(Cf. Appian, ix. Macedonica, iii)—that is, those of the summer, B. C. 201; when Philip was now in Caria. It is decisive, in our opinion, that Sulpicius' consular year was known by Polybius to have begun by, if not before, the time usually denoted by the beginning of winter; i. e. the end of October, or early in November. Polybius too recognizes here the embassies sent to Rome

[z] Livy, xxx. 40. 42. Cf. Pausanias, vii. vii. 3: x. xxxvi. 3.
[a] Livy, xxx. 42. [b] Ibid. xxxi. 3.
[c] Livy, xxxi. 5. Cf. Polybius, xvi. 25. 32. 27. § 1.
[d] Livy, xxxi. 9. 5. Cf. Pausanias, i. xxxvi. 4.
[e] Livy, xxxi. 5. Cf. Appian, ix. Macedonica, iii. Justin, xxx. 3. § 5. Pausanias supplies the name of the Athenian who was at the head of this second embassy to Rome; viz. Cephisodorus: i. xxxvi. 4.

Philip[f]. This *nova* legatio implies a *former*; and that too is recognized by implication in the first chapter of this Book of Livy[g]. It must have arrived sometime either before the end of B. C. 202 or early in B. C. 201; and it was no doubt this embassy and the complaints brought by it which occasioned the mission to Greece of Aurelius and his colleagues.

iv. *On the chronology of the first year of the war with Philip.*

It is important however to know that hostilities between Philip and the Athenians broke out in or soon after the month of September, B. C. 202. It follows from that fact that all the events of this war, which preceded the arrival of the consul Sulpicius at Apollonia[h], must have belonged to B. C. 201—200.

Among these were the proceedings of Attalus and the Rhodians, who came to the assistance of the Athenians by sea[c]. It appears from Livy that when they set out Philip was at the Hellespont[d]; and that he retreated before them to Macedonia[e]: that they proceeded without opposition as far as Athens[e]; and had they acted with all the promptitude and decision which the opportunity seemed to suggest that they might have terminated the war, without the interference of the Romans[e]: and this must be a plain intimation of the spring or summer of B. C. 201. But they lost their opportunity; Attalus remaining inactive at Ægina, the Rhodians returning home[e]: and this, as Livy represents the course of events, encouraged Philip to return to the Hellespont and begin the siege of Abydos[f], which was still going on when Sulpicius arrived at Apollonia[g] *.

to complain of Philip, in the latter half of B. C. 201, as we have concluded: Καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἠγνόει τὰς ἐξαποστελλομένας κατ' αὐτοῦ πρεσβείας εἰς Ῥώμην, διόπερ πέρας ἔχει τὰ κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην. xvi. 24. § 3.

* From this account of Livy's it is clear that he has taken no notice of the sea-fight of Chios, related by Polybius, xvi. 2–10: which was one of the events of this year, and probably one of the first, except very generally,

[f] Livy, xxxi. 5–8.
[g] Ibid. 1.
[h] Ibid. 14–18. Cf. Appian, ix. Macedonica, iii.
[c] Livy, xxxi. 14. 15. 18.
[d] Ibid. 14.
[e] Ibid. 15.
[f] Ibid. 16–18.
[g] Ibid. 14–18.

When the consul came to Apollonia, he found an Athenian embassy waiting for him there [h]; at the request of which he despatched C. Claudius Centho with 20 ships to raise the blockade of Athens. The rest of the fleet was stationed at Corcyra [i]; and apparently for the winter: and these facts laid together prove that, though it might not have been too early even when the consul arrived at Apollonia to go into port for the winter, yet neither could it have been too late for the performance even then of a particular service by sea, at no greater a distance from Corcyra than Athens. Claudius not only executed his commission in behalf of Athens [j], but shortly after surprized Chalcis in Eubœa [k]; which was followed by an attempt of Philip's in like manner to surprize Athens [l]: all which plainly demonstrates that the season was not even then too far advanced for operations either by land or by sea, though the equinox of autumn might be past; and because it was so, while the Roman fleet was still actively employed, Attalus with his was wintering at Ægina [m]: for it appears to have been a rule with this king not to keep the sea after the autumnal equinox [n].

Shortly after these things there is an account of a Panætolic assembly; at which, besides deputies from Philip and from the Athenians respectively, a Roman legate, L. Furius Purpureo [o], was also present. It seems to have been the custom among the Ætolians to hold an assembly of this kind soon after the ingress of their official year, and apparently on the first day of the month. Damocritus was their Prætor at this time [p]: and that he was the Prætor of a year just coming in, and not

xxxi. 14. After this action at Chios, Philip invaded Caria; xvi. 11: and as Polybius told us, (xvi. 24 supra,) not choosing to winter there, he must ultimately have marched to the Hellespont, and sat down some time or other to the siege of Abydos; xvi. 29: 34: (cf. Livy, xxxi. 18.) which was still going on, or only just over, when Sulpicius arrived at Apollonia; that is, at the end of the autumn, B. C. 201. There is no authority in Polybius for any retreat of Philip from Abydos before Attalus and the Rhodians, into Macedonia, and a return again to the siege of that place. On the contrary, when Attalus and the Rhodians sailed to Attica, he must have been in Asia Minor, Caria, &c.

[h] Livy, xxxi. 14.
[i] Ibid. 22.
[j] Ibid. 23.
[k] Ibid. 24: 25.
[l] Livy, xxxi. 25. 28.
[m] Ibid. 47: cf. the next year.
[n] Livy, xxxi. 29–31.
[o] Ibid. 32.

of one ready to go out, appears from the fact that he was still in office when the battle of Octolophus was fought between the Romans and Philip in the course of the ensuing summer[q]; the event of which determined him to espouse their side and not that of Philip. The Ætolian year B. C. 201, Period ii. 56 of their calendar, would enter October 8; and this meeting was probably held on the first day of the second month, November 7, when Attalus would certainly be in winter quarters: as he is said to have been at Ægina[r] at this time.

The Macedonian deputy on this occasion reckoned it to be *three* years to the time of this meeting since the conclusion of peace between the Romans and Philip, principally at the desire and through the mediation of these same Ætolians; and in the same place and at the same kind of assembly in which and at which they had met together on this occasion[s]. And that might be substantially correct: though, if the peace was actually concluded about the time of the comitia at Rome, U. C. 549, some time in the autumn B. C. 205, as Livy himself relates[t], he ought to have reckoned it *four* years rather than three. The Ætolian year at that time, Period ii. 52, would begin October 23. The peace was ratified at Rome about two months afterwards; probably some time in January B. C. 204. From that time to November 7, B. C. 201, the interval could not have been less than three years and ten months.

The proceedings of the next year, B. C. 200, are divisible into those of Sulpicius and Philip by land[u], and those of Attalus and of the Roman fleet under L. Apustius, by sea[w]. Both began at the same time, the Principium veris[x]; a note of time which in the idiom of Livy seldom implies an earlier season in the natural year than April or May: and both were brought to an end about the same time; with the return of Sulpicius to his former quarters at Apollonia[y], and that of Apustius to his at Corcyra[z], and that of Attalus[z] to Asia: all before the end of summer[a], and the autumnal equinox[b].

q Livy, xxxi. 40, 41.
r Ibid. 28. 33.
s Ibid. 29: cf. 1.
t Ibid. xxix. 10: 11: 12: 13. Cf. Appian, ix. Macedonica, ii. §. 1.
u Livy, xxxi. 33—43.
w Ibid. 44—47: cf. 27.
x Ibid. 33: 44.
y Ibid. 40.
z Ibid. 47.
a Ibid. 43: 47.
b Ibid. 47.

It is in our power too to shew that the mysteries, at which Attalus was initiated this year[c] prior to his return to Asia, actually fell out *before* the equinox: a coincidence which could not have held good of those of B. C. 201, nor of those of B. C. 199, but only of those of B. C. 200.

The chronology then of the first year of this Macedonian war is thus satisfactorily explained; and Livy's accounts are so far rendered consistent with the actual course of events *. But we now perceive that it is absolutely necessary to this effect that Sulpicius' year should be supposed to have borne date from some day much earlier than the Ides of March U. C. 554. For our part, we are strongly of opinion that this earlier day was the Ides of December U. C. 553, October 19 B. C. 201: and that both for the reasons which were assigned supra, and because of the relation of the calendar year to the natural just at this juncture of time, the old rule of the ingress on the Ides of December was revived upon this occasion.

For, though no intimation of that kind is actually discoverable in Livy, there is reason to believe that the change in the rule of the ingress, whatsoever it was, introduced in

* The fragments of Polybius, (all that remain of this part of his history,) as they have been arranged by his editors [1], labour under the same inconsistency as the accounts of Livy. For instance, according to the position assigned to one of these [2], Philip was among the Bargylii at the beginning of winter in the consular year of Sulpicius; and, according to that of the next [3], he was still there before the arrival of Attalus and the Rhodians at Athens. So that if *this* was an event of the spring of B. C. 201, Philip must have been wintering among the Bargylii, and Sulpicius must have entered on office, in the winter of B. C. 202. But in reality cap. 24 should have followed cap. 25. The true order of these fragments, as determined by that of the events to which they relate, seems to be *this*:

The sea-fight at Chios, early in the spring, B. C. 201.—xvi. 2–10.

Philip in Caria, soon after.—Ibid. 11.

Attalus and the Rhodians at Athens, summer, before the A. E.—25–27. Cf. Livy, xxxi. 15.

Philip retreats to the Hellespont and lays siege to Abydos soon after the A. E.—xvi. 24–29: Cf. 34. § 1. Livy, xxxi. 18.

Sulpicius lands at Apollonia, October, B. C. 201.

[c] Livy, xxxi. 47.

[1] xvi. 1—24. [2] xvii. 24. 1. 2. [3] xvii. 25.

this year of Sulpicius, was continued in force for the next two years at least. The comitia of L. Cornelius Lentulus P. Villius Tappulus (consuls of U. C. 555 Varr.) were held B. C. 200 by the consul Aurelius [d]. Livy supposes these consuls to have entered on the Ides of March [e] January 6 B. C. 199; yet Villius to have arrived in his province before winter [f], and to have moved from his quarters at Apollonia, as Sulpicius had done the year before, only at the beginning of spring [g] (April or May): and, what is most extraordinary, scarcely to have begun the operations of the campaign when T. Quinctius is spoken of as already appointed consul, and as already arrived at Corcyra on his way to supersede him [h]. So that for any progress made in the war Villius' year in Macedonia was little more than a total blank; and yet that it made one of the years actually past in that country [i] is beyond all doubt.

This report indeed of the coming of Quinctius was premature. We have seen [k] that he was still at Rome February 11 B. C. 198: and we were told that he had been detained *majorem partem anni* [l] (B. C. 199–198) by the procuration of prodigies of various kinds, and no doubt by that of the eclipse, among the rest. It is therefore a significant circumstance in the history of *his* year in the command, that no mention is made of *his* wintering in his province (at Apollonia) as both his predecessors were represented to have done; but that he is supposed to have entered at once on active operations [m]: though Livy very inconsistently speaks of his setting out Maturius quam priores soliti erant consules [m]; which would imply that he actually left Rome for Macedonia early in the autumn of B. C. 199, instead (as must really have been the case) early in the spring of B. C. 198. We are of opinion therefore that the most probable explanation of these different representations is the fact that each of these consular years really bore date from the Ides of December; Sulpicius' October 19 B. C. 201; Villius' October 10 B. C. 200; and Flamininus' September 30 B. C. 199. On which principle *his* comitia probably would be held in July or

[d] Livy, xxxi. 49 [e] Ibid. xxxii. 1. [i] Ibid. xlii. 34: xxxii. 28.
[f] Ibid. 3. 4. [g] Ibid. 5: 6. [k] Supra, p. 13. [l] Livy, xxxii. 9: 28.
[h] Ibid. 6. [m] Ibid. 9. 10 sqq.

August previously; just about the time when the report of his coming to relieve Villius appears to have reached Macedonia. The procuration of prodigies, reported at Rome only after September 30 B. C. 199, might easily detain him there until it was too late to think of crossing the sea until the spring of B. C. 198.

This change of rule then may be supposed to have been continued until the end of this Macedonian war; i. e. until the fourth year of the war at least, B. C. 198—197: in which T. Quinctius Flamininus was retained in the command Pro Consule[n]. The old rule might be restored under the consuls of the next year, U. C. 558 B. C. 197—196, L. Furius Purpureo M. Claudius Marcellus[o]; for it does not appear that they had been elected before the news of the battle of Cynoscephalæ, (which decided the war,) had been received at Rome[p].

CHAPTER V.

SECTION I.—*On the* Ver Sacrum *of B. C.* 217, *B. C.* 196, *and B. C.* 194.

i. Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 13. 354 days.

U. C. 558 Varr. 557 Cap. 555 Polyb. B. C. 197–196.

L. Furius Purpureo
M. Claudius Marcellus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 26 B. C. 197. Nundinal Char. 8.

---

[n] xxxii. 28.

[o] xxxiii. 24.

[p] xxxiii. 24. 25. It appears from Livy, xxxiii. 12. 7–10, that a truce of 15 days was conceded by Flamininus after the battle; and then (xxxiii. 13. Polyb. xviii. 17, 5. 22, 5.) a longer term of four months, in order that Philip might send ambassadors to Rome, to treat for peace: 4 months, 15 days, 135 days in all. Polybius says (xviii. 25.) that this embassy arrived after Marcellus was come into office. Let us suppose that he came into office on the Ides of March, Dec. 5 B. C. 197. If we reckon back 135 days from December 5, it brings us to July 23, as the earliest possible date of the battle of Cynoscephalæ: yet probably not far from the actual date.

ii. Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 15. 355 days.

U. C. 560 Varr. 559 Cap. 557 Polyb. B. C. 195–194.

P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus ii
Ti. Sempronius Longus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 5 B. C. 195. Nundinal Char. 3.

We are told by Livy[q] and Plutarch[q] that one of the first things which was done at Rome, after the battle of Thrasimene and after the appointment of Fabius Maximus to the office of Pro-Dictator, was to consult the Sibylline books; and then, in obedience to some direction supposed to have been discovered therein, to bind the republic among other obligations to that of the vow of the Ver Sacrum: the nature of which, and the probable origin of the peculiar appellation by which it appears to have been called, we may possibly have occasion to illustrate in connection with the history of the Primitive calendar under a different branch of our subject. What was denoted by it in this particular instance, and what kind of obligation the Romans were now contracting by this vow, appears sufficiently from Livy and Plutarch[r].

It is evident however from these accounts i. That the performance of this vow depended on a certain condition; Si respublica populi Romani Quiritium ad quinquennium proximum salva servata esset. ii. That even in this case no time was fixed for the actual performance of the vow. It could not become binding under any circumstances before the period prescribed beforehand; five years from B. C. 217: and it was not necessarily to be performed even then, though the obligation to its performance some time or other might then become final and confessed. We need not therefore be surprised to find no actual fulfilment of such a vow on record before the consular year of M. Porcius Cato L. Valerius Flaccus U. C. 559 Varro B. C. 196—195. This year entered on the Ides of March[s], November 25 B. C. 196: after which and after the division of provinces for the year Livy observes[t]; Provinciis ita distributis consules priusquam ab urbe proficiscerentur Ver Sacrum ex pontificum jussu fecere, quod A. Cornelius Mammula prætor voverat de senatus sententia

[q] Livy, xxii. 8. 9. 10. Plutarch, Fabius Maximus, iv. Cf. Dionysius, i. 16. 23. 24.
[r] Locis cit.
[s] xxxiii. 42. 43.
[t] xxxiii. 44.

populique jussu Cn. Servilio C. Flaminio consulibus. anno post uno et viginti factum est quam votum.

There were certainly 21 years only from a given time B. C. 217 to the same time B. C. 196. But if this vow was fulfilled at last, as Livy gives us to understand, only just when these consuls were departing from Rome to their respective provinces, it must have been in the spring of B. C. 195: and as the vow, contracted soon after the battle of Thrasimene, must have been so contracted in the summer, B. C. 217, it is manifest that it must have been fulfilled at last in the 22nd year, not in the 21st, after it had been contracted; and in the 22nd year exeunte too. Still on this point we need not press Livy too closely. The date of Thrasimene is fixed to the Roman June 22 U. C. 537 B. C. 217. There were 21 pairs of consuls between those of U. C. 537 and these of U. C. 559, both exclusive: and this perhaps was all that Livy looked at.

It is much more important for the illustration of our Roman calendar that we should endeavour to explain the reasons, which might have caused a delay of this kind between the contraction of a special obligation and its fulfilment at last; or which might have designated and pointed out this year of U. C. 558 B. C. 197–196 as the fittest for the performance of a vow made in U. C. 537 B. C. 217.

And on this question it is almost superfluous to observe first of all that this delay could have had nothing to do with the Lustral cycle; for, whether the interval between the vow and its performance was 21 years or 22 years, in neither case was it any measure of the Lustral period of five years. Secondly neither could it have had any thing to do with the cycle of the calendar; the *regular* cycle: which was one of 24 years. The Romans could not have been purposely deferring the fulfilment of the vow until this time, in order that the same year of the cycle might attest and seal the fulfilment, which had contracted and attested the obligation to it. And yet though the year of the cycle could not possibly have been regarded in this instance, yet, if we consider the nature of the vow itself, (that of the *Ver Sacrum*,) it is very conceivable that the relation of the calendar to the natural year at this time, and at the time when the vow was contracted, might be regarded; and very probably would be. Let us therefore

proceed to compare the calendar, as it stood B. C. 218—217, with the calendar as it was standing B. C. 197—196; in order to discover whether there was any thing at this time in the latter analogous to the former, so long before.

Comparison of the Regular, or Decemviral, Calendar Cycle x. 15 *and* 16, *B. C.* 218–217, *with the Irregular, Cycle* i. 13, *B. C.* 197–196.

Regular Calendar.			Irregular Calendar.		
Kalendæ.	Midn.	B. C.	Kalendæ.	Midn.	B. C.
ix Septembres	Sept. 29	218	i Januariæ	Sept. 26	197
x Octobres	Oct. 28	..	ii Februariæ	Oct. 25	..
xi Novembres	Nov. 28	..	iii Martiæ	Nov. 21	..
xii Decembres	Dec. 27	..	iv Apriles	Dec. 22	..
i Januariæ	Jan. 25	217	v Maiæ	Jan. 20	196
ii Februariæ	Feb. 23	..	vi Juniæ	Feb. 20	..
iii Martiæ	Mar. 22	..	vii Quinctiles	Mar. 21	..
iv Apriles	April 22	..	viii Sextiles	April 21	..
v Maiæ	May 21	..	ix Septembres	May 20	..
vi Juniæ	June 21	..	x Octobres	June 18	..
vii Quinctiles	July 20	..	xi Novembres	July 19	..
viii Sextiles	Aug. 20	..	xii Decembres	Aug. 17	..

It is evident from this comparison that, between the calendar as it stood B. C. 218–217 and the calendar as it was standing B. C. 197–196, there was as close an agreement as in the nature of things was possible in the case of a regular and of an irregular calendar; which after a certain time could not agree together except in name. The months, which in each of these calendars corresponded to the Julian March and April respectively, through their agreement to those two, and at this time, are seen to have coincided with each other almost to a day. They differed only in name; i. e. in being Martius and Aprilis in the regular calendar B. C. 217, and Quinctilis and Sextilis in the irregular B. C. 196. It is manifest therefore that the two summer months in the regular calendar, B. C. 217, Quinctilis and Sextilis, at this particular juncture of B. C. 196 had got into the place of the two spring months, Martius and Aprilis; and that being the case this juncture of time B. C. 196 might be purposely fixed upon as the fittest which could have been selected for the fulfilment of so peculiar a vow as that of offering the productions

of spring at last, under the same circumstances under which they had been dedicated at first. These months B. C. 217 were Martius and Aprilis, and B. C. 196 they were Quinctilis and Sextilis: i. e these two latter B. C. 196 were representing the very same months in the natural year, as the two former B. C. 217. This coincidence might evidently have the effect of designating these two months B. C. 196, as the most appropriate for the fulfilment of the vow which had already devoted the productions of spring in particular to a certain purpose. Add to this that the vow also must have been made in the same month of Quinctilis B. C. 217, which by its place in the natural year B. C. 196 was now reminding the Romans of the vow itself. The battle of Thrasimene was fought June 22 Roman U. C. 537 July 12 B. C. 217: and it would be easy to shew from the course of circumstances after it[u] that Fabius must have been appointed prodictator within eight or ten days at the utmost from the time when the news of the defeat reached Rome. This vow of the Ver Sacrum then contracted so soon after was undoubtedly contracted in the month Quinctilis.

We may conclude therefore that this time was purposely chosen for the discharge of the vow at last because the state of the calendar relatively to the natural year B. C. 196, *mutatis mutandis* only, was as nearly as possible identical with what it had been in the same respect B. C. 217, when the vow itself was made. We may suppose too that under such circumstances the Ver Sacrum in question, (which must have been intended of the productions of spring in some sense or other,) was reckoned to consist of the young of those animals of a specified description[w] which had been born in the course of nature between March 21 and May 20 B. C. 196; and that these having thus been formally declared designate and set apart for that purpose at this time B. C. 196, they were offered at last, in the manner prescribed by the terms of the vow[w], B. C. 195. They would consequently be so designated in the spring B. C. 196, just 21 years after B. C. 217; though they would not be actually sacrificed before the same time B. C. 195, just before the consuls of the year took the field, 22 years after B. C. 217. And it would

[u] Livy, xxii. 7—9. [w] Ibid. 10: Plutarch, Fabius Maximus, iv.

seem that on this principle it must have been considered necessary to the due discharge of the obligation which was understood to have been properly contracted by the vow, whether expressly so specified in its terms or not, that each of the animals in question, which composed this *Ver Sacrum* in the complex, should be a year old when it was actually offered at last.

SECTION II.—*On the repetition of the* Ver Sacrum B. C. 194; *and on the reasons to which it was probably due.*

The state of the calendar at each of these points of time B. C. 218–217 and B. C. 197–196 respectively was such that the Januarius of the latter had got into the place of the September of the former, and the Quinctilis of the one had got into the place of the Martius of the other. Consequently, if Martius and Aprilis were to be considered the spring months B. C. 217, Quinctilis and Sextilis must have required to be so considered B. C. 196. To place this out of question we have only to observe that the Kalendæ Januariæ B. C. 197, as the scheme shews, were falling September 26; on the very day of the true equinox of autumn for that year: and the Kalendæ Quinctiles B. C. 196 were falling on March 21, only three days earlier than March 24 the true date of the equinox of spring that year also. On every principle then there would seem to have been abundant reason why this year B. C. 196, and this time of the year, between the Kalends of Quinctilis and the Kalends of September, should have been selected for declaring and setting apart those particular productions of the natural year and of the spring time of that year, to which the terms of the vow in B. C. 217 had specifically bound the republic.

It must be evident too on this principle that according to the *prima facie* construction of the vow by the pontifical college the productions of the natural season of spring in question must have been supposed to be those of these two months of the calendar Quinctilis and Sextilis, in particular; nor could any one say that such a construction of the *prima facie* meaning and obligation of the vow was not the most agreeable to common sense and to the reason of things which could have been put upon it. Nevertheless the *actual* state

of the calendar at this particular juncture B. C. 196 being such that the calendar months of the spring *de facto* had got into the autumn of the natural year, and the calendar months of summer had got into the spring of the natural year; this state of the case was obviously capable of suggesting a certain doubt, and of giving occasion to a certain scruple, which was very likely to have weight with the Romans of the time, predisposed as they were to misgivings and misapprehensions of that kind. And this doubt and this scruple, under the circumstances of the case, would be Whether the natural productions of Quinctilis and Sextilis, the two summer months of the calendar, could with propriety be considered and called a *Ver Sacrum?* could be treated as if they had been those of the two spring months of the calendar, Martius and Aprilis?

Now this doubt and this scruple appear to have actually suggested themselves first to the Pontifex Maximus, P. Licinius Crassus, and then through him to the rest of the pontifical college. For Livy proceeds to relate of the next year, U. C. 560 Varr. B. C. 195–194[x], after the ingress, i. e. the Ides of March, Nov. 15 B. C. 195, and after the sortitio of of provinces for the year[y]; Ver sacrum factum erat priore anno M. Porcio et L. Valerio consulibus. id quum P. Licinius Pontifex non esse recte factum collegio primum deinde ex auctoritate collegii patribus renuntiasset; de integro faciendum arbitratu pontificum censuerant . . . *Ver Sacrum* videri pecus quod natum esset inter Kalendas Martias et pridie Kalendas Maias P. Cornelio Scipione et Ti. Sempronio Longo consulibus.

This testimony is amply sufficient to designate beyond all doubt the two calendar months of spring, Martius and Aprilis; as indeed, according to the regular calendar, they must always have been: their *earliest* limits in that being March 6 –May 5; their *latest* April 5–June 4; their *mean,* or normal and proper, being March 18–May 17.

There is consequently every reason to conclude that the moving cause to this repetition of the *Ver Sacrum* was such as we have supposed; the raising of a question whether the actual productions of the two spring months of the year, or

[x] xxxiv. 42. [y] 43, 44.

those of the two spring months of the calendar, were to be considered what the terms of the vow intended by the Ver Sacrum. If the natural productions of spring were to be understood as so intended, those of Quinctilis and Sextilis in the calendar must have been considered to answer to them B. C. 196; if the actual productions of the spring months of the calendar were to be supposed to have been meant, those of Martius and Aprilis alone B. C. 196 should have been set apart. On the first occasion the college had ruled that the former must have been meant; and every one we think must allow that they had judged and ruled rightly. On this second occasion they were called upon to revise that judgment; and the effect of this revision it seems was to reverse it, and to decide that according to the strict and literal interpretation of the terms of the vow, and of the obligation contracted thereby, the latter was the proper construction. It is self-evident under such circumstances that the question was one which lay entirely between the *spirit* and the *letter* of the terms of a particular obligation; that *before* the pontifical body had construed them strictly in conformity to the spirit, though contrary to the letter, and that *now* they were doing just the reverse, construing them strictly in conformity to the letter, but altogether contrary to the spirit. And it seems this idea of reversing their former decision, and on such grounds as these, did not occur first to the body in general but to the Pontifex Maximus in particular. It gives us therefore, as we before observed[x], an insight into his character and the turn of his mind; and it renders it less surprising that just such another scruple and misgiving as this, or if possible one even more repugnant to common sense than this, working on the peculiar susceptibilities of such an habit and turn of mind as his, should have led to the abandonment of the regular cycle and regular administration of the calendar while he had the charge of both. For that this did take place *de facto* while this Pontifex was at the head of the college does not admit of a question.

It is clear however that no such doubt as this could ever have arisen, but for the peculiar state of the calendar at the time; i. e. the fact that Quinctilis and Sextilis in the civil

[x] Page 28.

year had now got into the same place in the natural year which should have been occupied by Martius and Aprilis. It is therefore itself one among other confirmations of the truth of our calendar, not only for the particular year in which it appears to have arisen, but also for the whole of the administration from B. C. 208 downwards; which had brought the calendar itself in this particular year of B. C. 196 into so peculiar a state of relation to the natural year, and one so contrary to its proper relation to it at any time and to its nominal relation to it at all times.

As to the period of the year, at which this revision of the vow was probably taking place; it may be inferred from the terms of the decision—Ver Sacrum videri quod *natum esset* (*Had been born*, not *Should be born*) inter Kalendas Martias et pridie Kalendas Maias—that it must have been later than the Kalends of May at least here specified, December 31 B. C. 195: and we may presume that it was actually taking place about the same time B. C. 194 at which the offering of the Ver Sacrum (previously set apart in B. C. 196) had taken place in B. C. 195; that is, about the time of the departure of the consuls of the year to their provinces.

The limits prescribed on this second occasion were November 1 and December 30 B. C. 195. They included between them the Roman Martius and the Roman Aprilis of U. C. 560 Varr.; and comprehended a period of 60 days exactly. We consider however nothing more to have been intended in this specification than to define the precise limits of spring properly so called *in the calendar*; its *actual* limits, while the calendar was regular, its *nominal* limits even when it was irregular. The months thus defined are clearly two, Martius and Aprilis. In strictness the spring months of the regular calendar must have been three, Februarius, Martius, and Aprilis: but there might sometimes be a doubt concerning the first whether it did not belong as properly to the winter as to the spring. But there never could be any doubt on that point concerning the two latter.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION I.—*On the date of the opening of the campaign in the first year of the war with Antiochus.*

Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 18. 377 days.

U. C. 563 Varr. 562 Cap. 560 Polyb. B. C. 192–191.

M'. Acilius Glabrio
P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica.

Kalendæ Januariæ Aug. 4 B. C. 192. Nundinal Char. 3.

This year was the first of the war with Antiochus Magnus. The command of the army for this first year of that war fell to the lot of the consul Acilius [a]. And Livy tells us that he ordered his troops to rendezvous at Brundusium on the Ides of May; and set out himself from the city, to put himself at their head, on the v Nonas Maias [b]. Omnibus jam satis comparatis M' Acilius consul edixit ut quos L. Quinctius milites conscripsisset.....uti omnes Brundisium Idibus Maiis convenirent. ipse ante diem quintum Nonas Maias paludatus urbe egressus est. per eosdem dies et prætores in provincias profecti sunt.

Now, were nothing known from any other quarter of the state of the Roman calendar at this particular time, it might have been inferred from the preceding statement that it must have been still regular, still true to the natural year; that the Roman Maius at least must now have been occupying that place in the natural year which was the most convenient for transporting an army from the coast of Italy to the opposite coast of Greece, aud the most likely to be fixed upon in these times for crossing the sea under any circumstances: and this place, as every one would allow, must have been much the same *then* as that of the Julian May *at present*.

[a] Livy, xxxvi. 1, 2: xxxv. 24. 41. [b] Ibid. xxxvi. 3.

If so, these statements of Livy might have been implicitly received and argued upon as proofs that the calendar was regular at this time; or had not yet deviated sensibly from its regular place in, and its proper relation to, the natural year.

A very little attention however to the subsequent account of things would soon convince us that if Livy was to be rendered consistent with himself this conclusion must be premature. For i. it appears that when these things were going on at Rome or in Italy it was still the Hibernorum tempus [c] at Chalcis in Eubœa, where Antiochus himself was at this time. ii. Even after this it was still only the middle of winter when the consultation was held at Demetrias [d] concerning the occupation of Thessaly, at which Hannibal was present. iii. The time of moving out of winter-quarters was scarcely yet arrived at a still later period, when Philip gave notice to the Roman proprætor M. Bæbius of Antiochus' entrance into Thessaly [e]. iv. It was still winter *ten* days after the occupation of Pheræ [f]; and even when Antiochus was now before Larissa: Nunc hiemem et tempus anni nulli bellicæ rei..... aptum.....itaque hiemem instare apud suos caussatus: and that was still the case when he returned to Demetrias and from thence to Chalcis [g]; and even when, after all these things, he was at Chalcis [h] celebrating his marriage to the young woman whom Polybius calls Eubœa*: his army meanwhile being disposed In hibernis in Bœotia.

The Principium veris and the resumption of military operations by Antiochus on the one hand and by Philip and Bæbius on the other [i] are mentioned after all the preceding events; and the first allusion to the actual passage of the Roman consul across the sea is interposed between: and that too, as the context shews, only in the shape of a rumour

* He says however that this name was given her by Antiochus himself. Appian Syriaca 20 calls her Εὐβία.

c Livy, xxxvi. 5. Cf. Polybius, xx. 3. § 1–8. § 4. Appian, Syriaca, 16.

d Livy, xxxvi. 6, 7.

e Ibid. 8. Cf. 13.

f Ibid. 9, 10.

g Ibid. 10, 11.

h Ibid. 11. Polybius, xx. 8. Cf. Athenæus, x. 54. Justin, xxxi. 6. § 3. Appian, Syriaca, 16. Florus, ii. 8, 9. Zonaras, ix. 19. 451. A. B. Diodorus, xxix. supposes this marriage to have been celebrated at Demetrias.

i Ibid. 11. 13. Cf. 10. Appian, Syriaca, 17—20.

arising out of the season of the year, as the first which had yet occurred of which advantage might have been taken for such a passage; Hunc rumorem quia similem veri tempus anni maturum jam ad navigandum faciebat, rex....Chalcidem rediit[k]. Nor had Acilius in fact yet crossed the sea. The mention of his passage historically and of the landing of his army in Greece and of his marching, (as he did first of all,) to Larissa occurs after all these things[l]; Per eos forte dies M' Acilius consul.....mari trajecto pedestres copias Larissam ducere delectos militum tribunos jussit: and it appears that he landed first in Thessaly[m].

It is quite clear then that the time appointed by the consul for the assembling of his troops at Brundusium, followed by his own departure from Rome against the same day, could not have been that when it was either intended or expected that they were to put to sea. It has turned out on inquiry into the circumstances of this time that it must have been the middle of winter; when the sea at this period of antiquity, (and especially in the opinion of the Romans, and for any such purpose as the transport of armies and of the munitions of war,) was considered to be shut. It turns out too that the time when the sea was actually crossed by them at last was later than the *Principium veris* and the *Tempus ad navigandum jam maturum*; neither of which in these times could have been earlier than the vernal equinox: nor even so early.

Instead then of coinciding with the Julian May the Roman Maius at this time must have been coinciding with the middle of winter. No conclusion but this could possibly be deduced from a careful and critical consideration of the course of subsequent events; and none else, it is evident, could have served to reconcile Livy to himself. Now all this is explained by our calendar. The year of Acilius Glabrio entered on the Ides of March U. C. 563 Varr. Nov. 5 B. C. 192. The v Nonas Maias that year, when he set out for Brundusium, fell on December 23rd; and the Ides of May, appointed for the muster of his troops there, fell on January 4 B. C. 191. Why that day in particular was fixed upon for this purpose is another question; which we are not bound to be able to

[k] Livy, xxxvi. 12. [l] Ibid. 14. [m] Cf. 12.

answer. But it was probably because the consul was proposing to pass the winter properly so called, (i.e. reckoned from the solstice December 24,) at Brundusium and on the spot, rather than any where else; in order to be able to cross the sea on the earliest opportunity which might present itself in the ensuing spring. On the next occasion of the same kind, B. C. 190, the rendezvous at Brundusium was appointed for the Ides of Quinctilis, March 18; and the consul left Rome to repair thither himself on the v Idus, March 14. And this is probably what Acilius himself would have been found to have done on the present occasion, had he deemed it adviseable to pass the winter at Rome and not at Brundusium.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* i. 19. 378 *days.*

U. C. 564 Varr. 563 Cap. 561 Polyb. B. C. 191–190.

L. Cornelius Scipio (*post dict.* Asiaticus)
C. Lælius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Aug. 16 B. C. 191. Nundinal Char. 2.

i. *On the date of the battle of* Magnesia ad Sipylum.

The truth of our Roman calendar and of its particular details, for this year of the city, is placed out of doubt by the eclipse of the v Idus Quinctiles in this year of the city, and of March 14 Julian, B. C. 190[n]. It is superfluous therefore to enter on the consideration of the events of this year, solely for that purpose. But the year is memorable in Roman history as that of the first expedition of the Romans into Asia Minor. Its moral effect on the character, manners, and policy of the Romans from the same time forward has been noticed as something remarkable: and not for the better but for the worse. One of its events was the battle of Magnesia ad Sipylum, which decided the war with Antiochus; and with the knowledge of those facts which have been left on record as preceding it, and with the assistance of our calendar, we are able to determine the very day of this battle. The naval transactions of the year also gave birth to two important actions by sea; the battle of Phaselis or Sida, and that of

[n] Supra, p. 5.

Myonnesus: and we are able to determine the day of the latter also. We hope therefore to be excused, if we dwell somewhat particularly on both the military and the naval proceedings of this year; so far at least as may be necessary for each of these purposes, the determination of the date of the battle of Magnesia by land, and of that of Phaselis and that of Myonnesus by sea. And, though the date of each of these latter battles in strictness was earlier than that of the battle of Magnesia, we will nevertheless begin with inquiring into the date of this battle of Magnesia.

ii. *On the date of the arrival of the army under Scipio at the Hellespont; and on the term of days in the Roman Calendar of the* Mota Ancilia necdum condita.

The consul Scipio appointed his forces to rendezvous at Brundusium, against the commencement of this Asiatic campaign, on the Ides of Quinctilis in his year; March 18 B. C. 190: and he set out himself from Rome to take the command of them there on or about the v Idus of the same month[o]. And if we may suppose that this was done accordingly, and that every thing was ready for the passage on or soon after March 18; there seems to be no reason why we should not also suppose that the army was transported to Apollonia[p] in March or in April B. C. 190.

It is not necessary for our purpose to trace the march to the Hellespont[q] with a view to fix the chronology of its different stages. We may suppose the consul and his army already arrived at the Hellespont[r]. The day of their arrival there is otherwise known; and the length of the stay which they made there is known also.

The consul Lucius Scipio was accompanied on this occasion by his brother Publius Scipio, in quality of one of his legates and one of his council: and Publius Scipio it appears was a member of the order or college of the Salii among the Romans. It was a point of religion with the members of this body to take no part in any military proceedings—not to carry arms, or to perform any of the ordinary duties of

[o] Livy, xxxvii. 4. 1: xxvi. 45. [p] Ibid. xxxvii. 6. [q] Ibid. 6–33. Polybius, xxi. 1–10 Appian, Syriaca, 22. 23. [r] Livy, xxxvii. 33.

soldiers—and in particular not to *march* or travel, for that particular interval of time during which the Ancilia as they were called were in a state of motion, and had not yet been laid up or composed to rest again: Mota necdum condita. It so chanced that the anniversary of this ceremony in the Roman calendar came round just at the time when the army under Scipio arrived at the Hellespont on the present occasion. And though neither the consul nor his army were bound by this religion, and might have continued their march if they had chosen to do so; Publius Scipio the consul's brother and legate was bound by it, and forbidden to stir until this annual ceremony was over: and his presence with the army was considered to be of so much importance that rather than prosecute the march without him both the consul and the army thought it expedient to wait in a state of inactivity on the other side of the Hellespont, until he was at liberty to join them again.

Stativa deinde ad Hellespontum aliquamdiu habuerunt; quia dies forte quibus ancilia moventur religiosi ad iter inciderant. iidem dies Publium Scipionem propiore etiam religione quia Salius erat disjunxerant ab exercitu: caussaque et is ipse moræ erat dum consequeretur[s]—Αἴτιον δ' ἦν καὶ τοῦ μένειν τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης παρεμβολῆς καὶ τοῦ κεχωρίσθαι τὸν Πόπλιον ἀπὸ τῶν δυνάμεων τὸ Σάλιον εἶναι τὸν προειρημένον ἄνδρα. τοῦτο δ' ἐστι καθάπερ ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς Πολιτείας εἴρηται τῶν τριῶν ἓν σύστημα δι' ὧν συμβαίνει τὰς ἐπιφανεστάτας θυσίας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ συντελεῖσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς. * * τριακονθήμερον μὴ μεταβαίνειν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς θυσίας ἐν ᾗ ἂν χώρᾳ καταληφθῶσιν οἱ Σάλιοι οὗτοι. ὃ καὶ τότε συνέβη γενέσθαι Ποπλίῳ. τῆς γὰρ δυνάμεως μελλούσης περαιοῦσθαι, κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν οὗτος ὁ χρόνος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι μεταβαλεῖν τὴν χώραν. διὸ συνέβη τόν τε Σκιπίωνα χωρισθῆναι τῶν στρατοπέδων καὶ μεῖναι κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην, τὰς δὲ δυνάμεις περαιωθείσας μένειν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποκειμένων, καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι πράττειν τῶν ἐξῆς μηδέν, προσαναδεχομένους τὸν προειρημένον ἄνδρα[t].

This fragment of Polybius labours at present under some corruption or imperfection of the text. Still it is plainly to

[s] Livy, xxxvii. 33.

[t] Polybius, xxi. 10. § 10. Of the Salii, and the two orders each so called, see Vol. i. 172 note. We learn from Dio, xliv. 17 that while the Ancilia were in this state of motion they were kept in the custody of the Pontifex Maximus.

be collected from it that, under whatsoever circumstances these *dies anciliorum* might surprise the Salii, the obligation to inactivity entailed upon them in particular thereby lasted for the full term of *thirty* days; or for what is here called a τριακονθήμερον. With respect then to the stated date of this annual ceremony in the Roman calendar; in the Constantian calendar indeed of later times it seems to have been the vii Idus Martias: opposite to which in that calendar we find the note of Arma ancilia moventur. But this day in particular has no such notice attached to it in the older fragments of the Julian calendar[u]. In them the Feriæ Martis stand opposite to the first of March; and it must be clear from the Fasti of Ovid[w] that in his time both the Feriæ Martis and these Dies anciliorum must have been attached to the Kalends of March: and if in his time no doubt in the Roman calendar from the first also. There is an instance on record of the still continuing observance of this ceremony A. D. 69[x]; from which it appears that it had begun that year before Pridie Idus Martias at least. We may conclude then with every presumption of certainty that according to the ancient rule it began on the first of Martius; and that if it lasted 30 days it ended on the 30th of March. And it was probably because of this coincidence, (viz. that the ancilia, having been previously kept in a state of agitation 30 days, were laid up to rest again on the 30th of March,) that March 30 came to be marked in the Roman calendar as the Pacis Festum[y].

The arrival of the army at the Hellespont consequently must have coincided with the Kalends of March U. C. 565, October 25 B. C. 190: and it would be easy to shew, if necessary, that the previous account of its march would fully agree to that date[z]. We will observe only that on the Kalends of this month Scipio's consular year would be on the point of expiring; and that might be the reason why in his account of the negotiations going on about the same time at Elæa[a], between Antiochus on one side, and L. Æmilius the Roman admiral and Eumenes the king of Pergamus on the

[u] The Maffæan and Prænestine, apud Foggini.
[w] iii. 259—396.
[x] Tacitus, Historiæ, i. 89, 90. Suetonius, Otho, viii. 5.
[y] Ovid, Fasti, iii. 879—882.
[z] Cf. Livy, xxxvii. 2: 4: 6: 7: 14: 15: 16: 18: 19: 31.
[a] xxi. 8. § 2–13. Livy, xxxvii. 18: 19. Appian, Syriaca, 26: Livy, xxxvii. 20.

other, Polybius styles him Ἀνθύπατος [b]; though he was still strictly consul, and is recognized in that capacity by Polybius himself just before [c]. The time of these negotiations in fact was not earlier than that of Scipio's march through Macedonia [d].

iii. *On the date of the battle of* Magnesia.

The army then having crossed the Hellespont either on March 1 Roman October 25 B. C. 190, or the day before; the length of time for which it halted on the Asiatic side of the Straits must have been from March 1 Roman to March 31, from October 25 to November 24. And during this time negotiations were going on with Antiochus [e], which came to no effect.

On resuming his march (which we may presume would be done on the 31st of March, November 24); the consul moved first to Dardanum, then to Rhœteum, and then to Ilium: and these places were so near to each other that we cannot suppose he would be at Ilium later than April 2 Roman November 26.

From Ilium the army arrived at the head of the river Caïcus Sextis castris, i. e. December 2 Julian; and by this locality we understand Livy to mean that branch of this river, the source of which was just above Pergamus on the north-east. Some time was spent here, without continuing the march; and as that is left undefined in the narrative of Livy we shall not attempt to fix it for ourselves at present. We will observe only that during this interval Eumenes also arrived at the Roman camp; and he was sent back to Pergamus to fetch supplies of corn for the army from Pergamus: which implies that he passed through Pergamus on his way. And now too clear allusions begin to occur to the *winter*: Inde... consilium erat ire ad hostem priusquam hiems obprimeret [f]: which every one must allow to be only natural and consistent any time after December 2.

All this while Antiochus himself was supposed to be at Thyatira; though in reality he had moved thence to Magnesia ad Sipylum [f]: and therefore on resuming his march

[b] xxi. 8 § 11. [c] xxx. 8. § 7. Livy, xxxvii. 34—36.
[d] Livy, xxxvii. 18. [f] Ibid. 37: cf. 33 ad calc.
[e] Polybius, xxi. 10. § 7—xii. § 13. [f] Livy, loc. cit.

the consul directed his course in the first instance towards Thyatira. On the *fifth* day he arrived at the Campus Hyrcanus [g] *: and having first learnt there that the king had removed his headquarters to Magnesia, he followed him in that direction to the river Phrygius: and these localities too were all so near to each other that we can scarcely do wrong in supposing that he must have pitched his camp on this river either the same day on which he arrived at the Campus Hyrcanus or on the next.

Assuming then that the date of the arrival on the river Phrygius was the *sixth* day of the march from the head of the Caïcus, we make out, from Livy's account of subsequent proceedings, a continuous series of *eleven* days up to the date of the battle inclusive [h]: i. e. of *seventeen* days in all since the departure from the Caput Caïci down to the day of the battle. If then the date of that departure had been December 2, and the course of events meanwhile had been continuous and uninterrupted, the day of the battle, on that principle, must have been December 19.

We learn however from Frontinus [i] that, whensoever this battle was actually fought, it was on a *dies religiosus*. P. Scipio in Lydia cum die ac nocte imbre continuato vexatum exercitum Antiochi videret; nec homines tantum aut equos deficere verum arcus quoque madentibus nervis inhabiles factos: exhortatus est fratrem ut *postero* quamvis *religioso* die committeretur prælium. quam sententiam secuta victoria est †.

* Hyrcania, by the maps, was 70 Roman miles direct from Pergamus, and 60 from the source of the Caïcus—about 68 by road; consequently not more than 5 days' march.

† We do not know that it would make any difference to the truth of the fact, asserted by Frontinus, that the battle was fought at last on a *dies religiosus*, whether the idea of giving battle on such a day, for the reason assigned by Frontinus, was suggested to the consul by his brother Publius, or occurred to him of his own accord. The former would suppose that Publius was present with the army on the day of the battle, or up to the day before it at least. Yet at a later period of his history, B. C. 187,

[g] Livy, xxxvii. 38.

[h] Ibid. 38, 39. Appian, Syriaca, 30—31, would imply only *eight* days, after the time when the two armies came within sight of each other.

[i] De Strategematis, iv. vii. 30. Cf. Florus, ii. 8. § 17. Auctor De Viris, L. Scipio Asiaticus.

59205

This *dies religiosus* was no doubt one of the *dies postriduani;* either the day after the Kalends, or the day after the Nones, or the day after the Ides of the current Roman month. To decide among these, which it must have been *de facto,* we must refer to the calendar of the year itself. The last date determined with certainty having been the Julian December 2, the Roman April 8; December 19 on that principle must have coincided with Aprilis 25: and that would not have answered to the description of a *dies religiosus* so far as we know, in any sense; much less to a *dies religiosus* in general which coincided with a *dies postriduanus* in particular. The proper style of Aprilis 25 in the calendar of this time was the vi Kalendas Maias; and it is not known that that day was religious.

In our preceding calculations however we did not take into account the length of the stay at the Caput Caïci; which nevertheless, to judge from the context before and after, might very probably have been reckoned at *six* days: and that would bring out the date of the battle at last not on December 19 Julian Aprilis 25 Roman, but on December 25 Julian May 2 Roman,

Livy puts a statement into the mouth of P. Scipio Nasica [1], that on the day of the battle Scipio himself was at Elæa, (two days' journey distant,) and sick [2]. The only way of explaining this consistently with Frontinus would be to suppose that he returned to Elæa the day before the battle, after having urged on his brother the expediency and good policy of giving battle without delay the next morning; or that he sent the advice in question to him from Elæa. And we know not how far the former may be implied in the accounts of Appian [3]. It seems to be a well attested fact that the elder Scipio must have been at Elæa before the battle. Appian supposes him to have rejoined the consul after that event at Sardis, and yet from Elæa [4]. And it was to Elæa that Antiochus sent him back his son; made prisoner, according to Justin [5], at the Hellespont not long before: according to Pliny [6] in the battle itself.

It is not certain indeed whether any *dies postriduanus* was actually considered religiosus as yet, but the day after the Ides [7]. That however would make no difference to the actual date of the battle, vi Nonas Maias in any case.

1 xxxviii. 58: 42. 2 Cf. xxxvii. 57.
3 Syriaca, 30. Cf. Dio, Fragm. lxix.
4 Syriaca, 38: 36. Cf. Livy, xxxvii. 45. Polyb. xxi. 13. § 1.
5 xxxi. 7. § 4. Cf. Polyb. xxi. 12. § 3.
6 H. N. xxxv. 7. p. 401. Dio, Frag. lxix. Cf. Valerius Maximus, ii. x. 2 De Majestate: iii. v. 1 Quia præclaris, &c.
7 See Vol. i. 484. and cf. ad Ann. B. C. 168 infra.

a *dies postriduanus* in the Roman calendar, the day after the Kalends of the month, vi Nonas Maias; and therefore altogether such a day as that on which, according to Frontinus, the battle must actually have been fought. In fact, it must be evident that we have to make our choice only between this first of the Dies postriduani in the month of Maius, the day after the Kalends, and the two next, the day after the Nones, the 8th of the month, and the day after the Ides, the 16th of the month; for on one of these three days the battle must have been fought: and even the first of these two latter would imply a stay of 12 days at the Caput Caïci; of which, in our opinion, the circumstances of the narrative of these proceedings before and after could not admit.

The true date therefore of this celebrated victory in the Roman style of the time being was vi Nonas Maias U. C. 565: in the Julian was December 25 B.C. 190: and it is a singular coincidence that on this principle it was only one day earlier than the mean winter solstice for any meridian of these parts, December 26 (about midnight), and almost the very date of the true, December 24; which in this year, as calculation shews, might very possibly be determined to December 25 at midnight: and that serves to explain the language of the Roman consul to his soldiers, two days before the battle[k]. It is true there is no mention in Livy of the rain which according to Frontinus preceded the battle for a day and a night; but even he describes the morning of the battle in a manner which would be entirely consistent with the supposition of the cessation of a continued rain, just at that point of time; Nebula matutina crescente die levata in nubes caliginem dedit: humor deinde ab austro velut perfudit omnia. quæ nihil admodum Romanis eadem perincommoda regiis erat[l]. At the solstice of winter such weather as this for the climate of Magnesia ad Sipylum, and at break of day, would be very natural.

We may observe further that B. C. 190, as our general Lunar Calendar, (Period xiii. 9. 15,) shews the moon was new December 5; and therefore December 25, the day of the battle, was the 21st Luna: when the moon would not

[k] Livy, xxxvii. 39: cf. 45. Polybius, xxi. 13. 14. [l] Livy, xxxvii. 41. Cf. Appian, Syriaca, 33.

rise until, midnight and it would be dark for the first part of the night but not for the last. Appian tells us both armies were drawn out into the field Ἔτι νυκτὸς.....περὶ ἐσχάτην φυλακήν [m]: and that must imply that there was moonlight at the morning watch before the break of day. Antiochus also, escaping from the field of battle, arrived at Sardis about midnight; Media ferme nocte [n]: and left it again, to continue his flight to Apamea (which Appian calls also Celænæ) Quarta vigilia: and that too implies that there was still a moon at that time of the morning capable of giving some light before daybreak itself; as could not fail to be the case, December 26, with a moon only 21 days old.

iv. *On the date of the battle by sea at* Phaselis, *or* Sida *in Pamphylia.*

The election of prætors, along with the consuls, against this year of the city, 564 Varr. B. C. 191–190, was mentioned in its proper place [o]: and one of these was L. Æmilius Regillus. The command of the fleet on the coast of Asia fell to his lot [o]: and he set out from Rome for his destination [p] along with the consul Scipio on or about the v Idus Quinctiles.

The prætor of the year before and still commanding on the spot was C. Livius. The winter was passed by him at Canæ [q]. The resumption of active operations by the Romans under him and by the Rhodians their allies is dated at the vernal equinox, B. C. 190: Rhodii quo magis cessatum priore æstate erat eo maturius æquinoctio verno eumdem Pausistratum classis præfectum cum sex et triginta navibus miserunt [r]: and this cannot denote a much later time than March 24 B. C. 190. The intermediate events between this time and the arrival of Æmilius to supersede Livius, including the surprise of the Rhodians by Polyxenidas the admiral of Antiochus [s], must have so fallen out that Æmilius could have got only as far as the Piræus when he received the news of this latter event in particular, from the Rhodian prefect

[m] Syriaca, 31.
[n] Livy, xxxvii. 44. Appian, Syriaca, 36.
[o] Livy, xxxvii. 2.
[p] Ibid 4.
[q] Ibid. 8: cf. xxxvi. 45. Appian, Syriaca, 23—25.
[r] Livy, xxxvii. 9.
[s] Ibid. 9–14. Appian, Syriaca, 24–26.

Epicrates himself, who had been despatched after the surprise Ad fretum Cephalleniæ tuendum [t].

The fleet was delivered up to him by Livius at Samos [u]: and from the account of subsequent proceedings it appears that, when the fleet was now moving about to different parts of the coast of Asia Minor, the army under the consul had got into Thessaly [w]; and by and by into Macedonia [w]: and that when it had at last been concentrated at Samos, to watch the movements of the king's admiral Polyxenidas at Ephesus, M. Æmilius brother of the Roman prætor Lucius died at Rhodes [x], and that his funeral obsequies were celebrated there.

The first action by sea after this was the battle of Phaselis in Lycia or Sida in Pamphylia [y] between the Rhodian fleet under Eudamus and Pamphilidas, and the king's fleet, under Hannibal and Apollonius, approaching from Syria to join Polyxenidas at Ephesus. It is represented by Livy as the middle of summer when the Rhodians were lying in wait at Phaselis [z] in order to intercept them; for which reason and from the nature of the locality itself they were suffering previously from sickness: which induced them to determine on moving higher up the coast towards Aspendus and the river Eurymedon. And it was just after the execution of this determination that they fell in with the enemy's fleet approaching in the contrary direction.

Tardius navigaverant regii, observes Livy [a], with reference to the progress which they had made before this encounter, adverso tempore Etesiarum, quod velut statum Favoniis ventis esset. The Etesian winds blew from the north. The fleet of Antiochus, sailing at this time from Syria to Cilicia, would be sailing westwards, or at least to the north-west; especially if it had got as far as Sida, as it is said to have done by this time. In this case, its route lay almost in direct opposition to the Etesian winds. So far therefore Livy would appear to be consistent; and had he stopped with the words Adverso tempore Etesiarum—nothing would have been necessary for

[t] Livy, xxxvii. 13. 14. [u] Ibid. 14. 16. [w] Ibid. 17, 18. Cf. Polybius, xxi. 6. § 1, 2: and 3. § 11—13: a good deal later than the six months' truce previously conceded by the consul to the Ætoli: Livy, xxxvii. 7. 49. [x] Livy, xxxvii. 22. [y] Ibid. 22–24. [z] Ibid. 23. [a] Ibid.

the explanation of his statement except to suppose that this voyage from Syria to Cilicia was going on during the season of the Etesian winds; and therefore not earlier at least than the time when those winds usually began to blow: which the Greek Parapegmata commonly dated about July 26.

Nor can this conclusion respecting the actual time of the encounter of the two fleets be much affected even by the qualification which he subjoins to the statement: Quod velut statum Favoniis ventis esset. The Favonius of the Romans and the Ζέφυρος of the Greeks were the same wind; and each was that which we mean by the west wind as such. The construction of this part of the sentence is Velut quod statum esset (sc. tempus) Favoniis ventis: and the meaning of the observation is that the progress of the king's fleet owing to the direction in which it had been sailing previously had been as much retarded by the Etesian winds as it would have been by winds from the west. For in reality the direction in which it was sailing was the north-west; to which a west wind was almost as adverse as a north wind. The date of the battle of Sida then, which now ensued, being later than the middle of summer, and later than the setting in of the Etesian winds, might have been as early as the end of July or the beginning of August, B. C. 190; but not earlier, nor yet probably much later.

v. *On the date of the battle of* Myonnesus.

The battle of Myonnesus in which the fleet of Antiochus under Polyxenidas was defeated by the allied fleet under L. Æmilius[b] was the next of these proceedings in the present year by sea, and was a still more important event of the same kind as the last considered. This victory of the Romans led to the evacuation of Lysimachia by Antiochus[c]; and so opened the way to the consular army without opposition of any kind from Europe across the Hellespont into Asia.

The context of Livy implies that this second battle by sea must have been fought not long after the former; and it so happens that the date of this second battle is on record: and

[b] Livy, xxxvii. 26–30: xlv. 22. Polybius, xxi. 10. § 1. Appian, Syriaca, 27, 28.
[c] Livy, xxxvii. 31. Appian, Syriaca, 28.

therefore by means of it it is in our power to test the correctness of the date which we have seen reason to assign to the former. For though it is not mentioned by Livy at the time, yet it appears from what he afterwards records[d], that the prætor Æmilius, in the heat of the action, (or rather towards the end of the battle,) made a vow to the Lares Permarini; a vow to dedicate an Ædes to the Lares under that title: and a vow which was fulfilled accordingly just eleven years afterwards, U.C. 575 B.C. 180–179, L. Manlio Acidino Fulviano Q. Fulvio Flacco Cosse, by the actual dedication of such an Ædes: in which too the ceremony of consecration was performed by the Roman prætor's father, M. Æmilius Lepidus, the Pontifex Maximus for the time being, and at this particular period censor also[f].

An inscription too was set up on the same occasion over the doors of this Ædes; as well as a tablet in the Capitol over the doors of the Ædes Jovis there: declaratory of the cause which had led to its consecration. The former of these Livy thought it worth while to transfer to his own history, where it may still be read[g]: though its text as it stands is not free from corruption. And though the date of the victory was very probably recorded in this inscription, it is not found therein at present. The original inscription however has been recovered among the monuments still in existence at Rome; and it may be seen in the books of inscriptions[h]: and there the date is distinctly attested, in the style of the calendar for the time being, the irregular form of the Decemviral correction; viz. the xi Kalendas Januarias, December 20 Roman. And this date is further authenticated by the testimony of Macrobius[i], which recognizes the same day in the same relation to these Lares and under that name also. This day was no doubt consigned to the calendar in that specific relation, first because the vow was made on that day B. C. 190, when the battle of Myonnesus was fought and won; and secondly because the Ædes built in consequence of it was dedicated to them at last on the same day B.C. 179. And this particular case of the connection between the original date of a vow of this kind and that of its actual com-

[d] Livy, xl. 52. [e] Ibid. 43, 44. 52. [f] Ibid. 42. 45.
[g] xl. 52. [h] As apud Morcelli, Tom. ii. p. 9. [i] Saturnalia, i. 10. 241.

pletion some time more or less afterwards may lead to an inference of considerable importance to questions of this description; viz. That Ædes Sacræ, vowed to such and such divinities on such and such occasions howsoever long before, were generally consecrated at last on the same day of the same month on which and in which they had been vowed: and consequently that the date of the consecration consigned to the calendar is so far an argument of the date of the vow.

The question is then simply; On what Julian date did December 20 U. C. 564 of Varro fall? Our calendar for that year shews that it fell on August 19 B. C. 190. And this confirms our previous conclusion, concerning the date of the battle of Sida; some time about the end of July: consequently both later than midsummer and after the stated time when the Etesians began to blow.

At the time of this victory of Myonnesus the consul with the army was among the Ænii and Maronitæ[l]. At least the news of the victory reached him there. Consequently he had now got on the confines of Macedonia and Thracia. The letters of the prætor, announcing his success, arrived at Rome about the time of the comitia at which Cn. Manlius Vulso and M. Fulvius Nobilior were elected consuls[m]. And if these were held in the Roman January or February that would be five or six weeks after the battle. Soon after August 19 the autumnal equinox also would be at hand; which seems to explain the statement of Livy[n] that after some intermediate proceedings, later indeed than the battle but before the arrival of the consul at the Hellespont[o], (the date of which as we have seen was March 1 Roman October 25 Julian,) Æmilius was already preparing to go into winter quarters at Phocæa, Quia hiems adpetebat.

SECTION III.—*General Verification both of the details and of the sum total of the first Irregular Cycle, from B. C.* 209 *to B. C.* 190.

Here then it may be expedient to pause for a time, in order to verify our calendar, both in the details and in the sum

[l] Livy, xxxvii. 33. Cf. Appian, Syriaca, 29.
[m] Livy, xxxvii. 47. 48.
[n] Ibid. 32. 31.
[o] Ibid. 31–33.

total; as far as we have yet proceeded with our consideration of this first cycle of the Irregular Period: that is, first from B. C. 209 to B. C. 202, and secondly from B. C. 202 to B. C. 190.

With regard to the first of these intervals we may assume that the Kalends of January U. C. 546 December 29 B. C. 209 are given; and that iii Nonas Decembres U. C. 552 October 19 B. C. 202 is given also. In which case the last day of December Roman the same year, November 15, will be given too; and therefore the Kalends of January of the next year U. C. 553, November 16 B. C. 202, will likewise be given.

Now from December 29 at midnight B. C. 209 to November 16 at midnight B. C. 202 the interval in noctidiurnal time according to the Julian rule was 2513 days. To fill up this by means of the details of our calendar from the Kalends of January U. C. 546 at midnight to the Kalends of January U. C. 553 at midnight we have as follows.

One year of 377 days	= 377 days
Six years of 356 days	= 2136 days
Seven years	= 2513 days

Now the first of these years is the first of the regular cycle of the calendar at that period of its decursus; and its length is that of the first year of the regular cycle. There was no irregularity then in the first year of these first seven years of this first irregular cycle. The irregularity of the cycle for thus much of its decursus was confined to the last six of these seven years; and to the rule of administration applied *de facto* to them: and this it is evident must have been such that each of them could have consisted of neither more nor less than 356 days. It would not have been possible otherwise for the 3rd of December Roman in the last of these years to have coincided with October 19 Julian, or the 17th of December Roman with November 2 Julian: which nevertheless we now know to have been the case.

It is clear then that the rule of administration for these six years, the first six of the irregular administration of the calendar properly so called, must have been such as to give to each one day more than the length of the common years

of the regular cycle. The Nundinal character of the first of these six years being 8, and the Nundinal epact on the year of 356 days being 4; the effect of this rule on the cycle of the Nundinal character in the first month of the year, as long as it continued in operation, would necessarily be to make it recur from 8 to 4 and from 4 to 8 perpetually. As to the seat of this extra day in the calendar itself; we have already collected from the date of the battle of Zama[o], and from other considerations, that it must have been at the end of December: and we hope to meet with further proofs and confirmations of that conclusion as we proceed. In the case therefore of years of this particular magnitude, 356 days and nights, December Roman had 30 days instead of 29; and there was either an xviii Kalendas Januarias in that month in such years, though ordinarily there was only a xvii Kalendas Januarias, or the xvii Kal. was repeated, like the Bissex in February of after time.

With regard to the second interval; the Kalends of January U. C. 553 November 16 B. C. 202 are given; and the Kalends of Quinctilis U.C. 564 March 4 B.C. 190 are given: and therefore the Kalends of January the next year, August 29 B. C. 190 also.

Now from November 16 at midnight B. C. 202 to August 29 at midnight B. C. 190 the noctidiurnal interval in Julian time was 4304 days exactly. To fill this up in the details of our calendar from U. C. 553 to U. C. 565, we have

Two years of 356 days	=	712 days
Three years of 354 ..	=	1062 ..
Five years of 355 ..	=	1775 ..
One year of 377 ..	=	377 ..
One year of 378 ..	=	378 ..
Twelve years	=	4304 days

Nor does it appear to be possible to alter these arrangements in any manner without contradicting the matter of fact, in some respect or other, at last. The Kalends of January in the first year of these twelve are fixed, Nov. 16 B. C. 202; and the Kalends of January in the thirteenth are fixed also, August 29 B.C. 191. The Nundinal character of

[o] Vol. i. 482 sqq.

the first year being 8, that of the thirteenth must be 8 also: for $4304 = 538 \times 8$. And though it might be easy to give 8 days more or 8 days less to some one of the intermediate years, or to give 8 more in all, or 8 less in all, among the whole, without affecting thereby the Nundinal character of the thirteenth year; yet that could not be done without affecting the Kalends of January in the thirteenth year; and either raising them to September 6, or depressing them to August 21: neither of which could possibly be compatible with the truth.

It seems then that from B. C. 207 to B. C. 201 it was the rule of the administration of the calendar to admit no kind of year, but this of 356 days in length; and to tolerate no cycle of the Nundinal character of the year but this of 8 and 4 and 4 and 8 alternately. The last of the years so administered, B.C. 201–200, was also the first after the second Punic war; and whether that coincidence had any thing to do with the change of the rule of the administration observed until then, we cannot undertake to say: only that the next year, B. C. 200–199, the second year after the close of the second Punic war, the second of the war with Philip, a new rule of administration begins to appear; that of having one year of 354 and two of 355 days each, alternately. The effect of this new rule on the cycle of the Nundinal character was to make it recur in one particular order, that of 8, 6, 3, every three years. We have already explained[p] that in these years of 354 days a day was abstracted from Februarius; which in such years became a month of 27 days instead of 28, like the Merkedonius, in the regular course of things, in years of 377 days: and that the test of such years, in contradistinction to years of 355 days in which Februarius also would have 28 days, was the presence or the absence of a xvi Kalendas Martias. It is observable that B. C. 200–199 in the first year of this new standard of 354 days, which was the regular standard of the lunar year in the common years of the octaëteric cycle, the Kalends of January fell on October 28; and October 28 fell on the second or third day from the change of the moon: i. e. on the luna prima dated from the phasis.

This new rule continued to be the law of the administra-

[p] Vol. i. 490.

tion of the calendar down to U. C. 563, B. C. 192–191, the first year of the war with Antiochus. At this juncture of time in particular we have had the testimony of Macrobius[q] that the use of the Merkedonius of the regular calendar began to be restored; and it is observable that it must have been revived in this first instance, after so long an interval of disuse, in the shape of the intercalary month of 22 days, not in that of 23 days: the former of which had always taken precedence of the latter in the regular order of their alternation in the Decemviral cycle before it was laid aside. A Merkedonius of this amount having been intercalated B. C. 192–191, one of 23 days must have been introduced B. C. 191–190; otherwise the v Idus Quinctiles U. C. 564 never could have fallen on March 14 B. C. 190: and that too would be only agreeable to the old rule of the alternation in question. And thus the verification of our calendar, for the first nineteen years of the first cycle of the whole period of the irregular administration, both in the details and in the sum total of our arrangements, may now be considered complete.

SECTION IV.—*On the dates of three Triumphi acti extant in this cycle.*

i. Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 21. 378 days.

U. C. 566 Varr. 565 Cap. 563 Polyb. B. C. 189–188.

C. Livius Salinator
M. Valerius Messalla.

Kalendæ Januariæ August 18 B. C. 189. Nundinal Char. 5.

---

ii. Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 22. 377 days.

U. C. 567 Varr. 566 Cap. 564 Polyb. B. C. 188–187.

M. Aimilius Lepidus
C. Flaminius.

Kalendæ Januariæ August 31 B. C. 188. Nundinal Char. 3.

We shall make no remark on the first of these two years,

[q] Vol i. 501. 512.

except that the dates of two triumphs are extant, both which come within it: the first that of L. Æmilius Regillus, commander of the Roman fleet in the sea fight of Myonnesus, B.C. 190; consequently a Triumphus navalis: the second that of Lucius Scipio Asiaticus, who commanded the army in the battle of Magnesia ad Sipylum the same year: the former on the Kalends of February U. C. 566[r] September 16 B. C. 189; the latter Mense interkalario, Pridie Kalendas Martias[s], Nov. 5, the very last day of the Merkedonius the same year. And of course this ascertains the year of the city, which began on the Kalends of January August 18 B. C. 189, (U. C. 566,) to have been intercalary[t].

The date of one triumph the next year also is extant likewise: that of M. Fulvius Nōbilior De Ætolis et de Cephallenia[u]; Ante diem decimum Kalendas Januarias U. C. 567, M. Æmilio Lepido C. Flaminio Coss.[w] B. C. 188–187. Consequently December 21 Roman U. C. 567 Sept. 3 B. C. 187; strictly within the limits of U. C. 567, but only eight days before its end.

The date of another is also on record, seventy days later than this last; consequently coming within the limits of the same consular year as that, dated from the Ides of March U. C. 567, but in a different year of the city, dated from the Kalends of January. This was the triumph of Cn. Manlius Vulso, the colleague of Fulvius U. C. 565 B. C. 190–189; De Gallis or Gallo-Græcis; of which Livy speaks accordingly: Extremo anni (U. C. 567) magistratibus jam creatis ante diem tertium nonas Martias Cn. Manlius Vulso de Gallis . . . triumphavit[x]: that is, only ten days before the ingress of the next consular year, U. C. 568, March 15 Roman, Sp. Postumius Albinus Q. Marcius Philippus[x], November 22 B. C. 187.

The date of this triumph was consequently March 5 Roman U. C. 568 Nov. 12 B. C. 187. Nor need we be surprised that it was so much later than the war in which it was earned; a war both waged and ended in the summer of

[r] Livy, xxxvii. 58. (cf. xxxviii. 35): Polybius, xxii. 7. § 16, 17.
[s] Livy, xxxvii. 59.
[t] Cf. Vol. i. 514.
[u] Livy, xxxix. 4.
[w] Ibid. xxxviii. 42: xxxix. 6.
[x] Ibid. xxxix. 6. 8: cf. 7.

B. C. 189. Manlius was at Ephesus at the beginning of the spring next after his Gallo-Græcian campaign[y], B. C. 188. He spent the winter of that year (B. C. 188–187) at Apollonia: Per Macedoniam in Thessaliam exercitum traduxit: inde per Epirum Apolloniam quum pervenisset, nondum adeo hiberno contemto mari ut trajicere auderet, Apolloniæ hibernavit[z]. It is clear therefore that he could not have returned to Italy before the spring or the summer of B.C. 187. Just before his return he is spoken of as being then in the second year of his command[a], that is, in his proconsular year. The consuls of U. C. 567 B. C. 188–187 had been already despatched to their provinces, before his arrival[b]: and that would not be the case until the spring of the year was far advanced. And after this the opposition made to his triumphing at all[c], and the delays thereby occasioned, might very well take up the rest of the official year, until near its close; only ten days after the actual date of his triumph[d].

SECTION V.—*On the date of the suppression of the* Bacchanalia.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle i. 23. 355 days.

U. C. 568 Varr. 567 Cap. 565 Polyb. B. C. 187–186.

Sp. Postumius Albinus
Q. Marcius Philippus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 12 B. C. 187. Nundinal Char. 2.

This year[e] is memorable in Roman history as that in which the rise and progress of the Bacchanalia, at Rome and in other parts of Italy, came under the cognizance of the Roman senate; and measures were taken for their suppression[f].

From the time when the existence of this society was made known to the consul Postumius[g] mention occurs of two days only, during which he was employed in making inquiries into

[y] Livy, xxxviii. 27. 37: cf. 39. Polybius, xxii. 24. § 1: Olymp. 147. 4 exeunte: 27. § 12.

[z] Livy, xxxviii. 40. 41. Appian, Syriaca, 43.

[a] Livy, xxxviii. 42. 44: cf. xxxviii. 35, the consuls of B. C. 189—188.

[b] Ibid. 44: cf. 42.

[c] Ibid. 44—50: xxxix. 4. 6.

[d] For the Nundinal dates of these triumphs, see Vol. ii. 86, 87. No lxxxi: lxxxii.

[e] Livy, xxxix. 6. 8.

[f] Ibid. 8 sqq. Cf. Valerius Max. vi. iii. 7 De Severitate: Firmicus, De Errore Falsæ Religionis, cap. v: Augustin, De Civitate, xviii. 13.

[g] Livy, xxxix. 11.

it privately himself; Post diem tertium [h], (some time after the third day,) he brought the subject under the notice of the senate. The proceedings which ensued from this time forward must be considered as the formal acts of the ruling body at Rome; and to judge from the Senatus edictum, still extant [i], dated Nonis Octobribus, they must have occupied the whole of the interval from the ingress of the consular year, or soon after it [k], the Ides of March Nov. 22 B. C. 187, to the Nones of October June 11 B. C. 186 [l]: the reason of which no doubt was because the inquiry into this association was not confined to Rome but extended to its ramifications over the whole of Italy [m]; so that it might very possibly not be brought to an end before the usual time of the comitia, when the year of Postumius was now *in exitu* *.

* With regard to this affair of the Bacchanalia in general; Livy, (xxxix. 8, 13;) attributes the first introduction of the rites in question into this part of Italy to some Græcus ignobilis; who taught them first of all to the women of Etruria. We can venture only on a conjecture as to their nature in this first instance. But, to judge from cap. 13, they seem at first to have been nothing more than the Hellenic rite of the Thesmophoria; having been confined at first to the women, and celebrated in the day-time, and as it appears for some *three* days only. The Attic Thesmophoria were celebrated for *four* days; yet, from a gloss on the word τριήμερος (sc. ἑορτή) in Hesychius — Θεσμοφόρια, ὑπὸ Λακώνων — there must have been Grecian communities, among which they were celebrated only for *three* days. The Græcus ignobilis of Livy probably belonged to some of these: at least it is not probable that he was an Athenian.

We may conjecture too from the *ten days'* castimonia, alluded to in cap. 9, preparatory to the ceremony of the initiation, (which ceremony began at *night* on the tenth day,) that the stated date of the ceremony at first was the first three days next after the tenth of the proper month, that is, the 11, the 12, and the 13th—and this too, though not absolutely the same as the Attic rule of the Thesmophoria at this time, would still be analogous to it. At the time to which the inquiry in Livy belongs, and for some years before, the rule was to celebrate these *initia* every month, and for five days, not three merely, in every month. But the condition of the ten days' castimonia, preparatory to them, was still in force even now; so that we may very probably infer that the ceremony still began, as before, on the night of the tenth, (the eleventh of the month reckoned from sunset,) but lasted now till the fifteenth at sunset—five days complete, i. e. till the middle day of the month. If Livy had been more circumstantial

[h] Livy, xxxix. 11–14.
[i] Livy, Ruperti, iv. 780. No. iii.
[k] Livy, xxxix. 8 ad princ.
[l] Cf. Ibid. 18. [m] Ibid. 17: 18; 23.

For *our* purpose however the most important coincidence connected with these proceedings appears to be *this*; That as far as we can collect from the terms of the edict, above referred to, and issued at last, it must have been published just before a Nundinal day. The following terms occur in it: HAICE. VTEI. IN. COVENTIONE. EXDEICATIS; NE. MINVS. TRINVM. NOVNDINVM. SENATVOSQUE. SENTENTIAM. VTEI. SCIENTES. ESETIS. EORVM. SENTENTIA. ITA. FVIT. . . . . ATQVE. VTEI. HOCE. IN. TABOLAM. AHENAM. INCEIDERETIS. ITA. SENATVS. AIQVOM. CENSVIT. VTEIQVE. EAM. FIGIER. JOVBEATIS. VBEI. FACILVMED. GNOSCIER. POTISIT.

Now the character of the year, as our calendar shews, being 2, and the year itself being a common one, (i. e. consisting of 355 days,) the viii Idus Octobres, October 8, Roman, was Nundinal; and therefore the Nones of October, October 7, was the last day of a Nundinal cycle, the day before the Nundinal day itself. If then it was intended that this edict should be made public as early as possible, yet so as to be exhibited for one *Trinundinum*, or term of three Nundinal days, if not of three Nundinal cycles, in sequence, in order that it might become known to the Plebs rustica as generally as to the Plebs urbana; no day it is evident could have been so convenient for its promulgation as the Nones of October: in which case it might easily be engraved on brass the same day and published the next, the first day of a Nundinal cycle, October 8 Roman.

in his account of the preceding history of these initia, it would very probably have been found that this change was made in the rule when the society was established at Rome; and very probably also because of the peculiar relation of the Roman calendar of the time to that by which these initia were kept. There is good reason to believe that the proper month of the rite at first must have been some one the site of which in the natural year corresponded to that of the Attic Pyanepsion; i. e. partly to October partly to November. In the instance which gave occasion to the inquiry at Rome, that of the initiation of Æbutius in particular, to judge from its place in the context of the history of the year, *this* must certainly have been expected to take place either just before or just after the ingress of the consular year; the Ides of March Roman, November 22 Julian. But the rule at this time was to initiate once a month. That case therefore does not prove that *this* was originally the stated time of the ceremony; though it may nevertheless have been so.

To have determined however, from contemporary testimony like this, and on grounds of such great probability as these, an authentic Nundinal date in terms of the calendar for the time being, viii Idus Octobres U. C. 568 Varr. June 12 B. C. 186, would be a point of much importance to the constitution and details of our calendar both before this date and after it. The Nundinal character of the Roman October this year being given; that of the Roman January both before and after it is given also, on *one* supposition only: viz. that the year, of which the Januarius in question was the first month and the October in question was the tenth, was a year of 355 days. The former then being 8, that of the Januarius before it must have been 2, and that of the Januarius after it must have been 7.

Now it may be assumed as certain that the Kalends of January U. C. 565 fell on August 29 B. C. 190; and that the Nundinal character of January that year was 8. The Nundinal character then of U. C. 565 was 8; that of U. C. 569 was 7. The interval between the Kalends of January U. C. 565 and the Kalends of January U. C. 569 was four Roman years complete. One of these we know from testimony to have been intercalary, and to have contained either 377 or 378 days. Having these data given, we shall find it no easy matter to arrange these years in sequence so as to agree with every thing to which they would be bound to agree, in any manner but that which has been actually adopted in our calendar.

U. C. 565	B. C. 190–189	355 days	
.. 566	.. 189–188	378 ..	
.. 567	.. 188–187	377 ..	
.. 568	.. 187–186	355 ..	
U. C. 565–568	B. C. 190–186		$1465 = 183 \times 8 + 1$

From which it follows that if the Nundinal character of U. C. 565 was 8 that of U. C. 569 would be 8–1 or 7; just as it appears to have been. We might indeed vary the disposition of these years so far as to have the second year of 355 days between the two of 377 and 378 respectively; not however without disturbing the relation of the dates of some

of the triumphs considered supra to the Nundinal cycle, and making them fall on a Nundinal day: which, though possibly admissible under some circumstances, yet in our opinion would be objectionable and contrary to the general rule of the time.

And having thus explained, and by actual cases in point illustrated, the principles on which we have proceeded in determining the arrangements of these irregular cycles from first to last, and the many minute and critical points of distinction to which it was necessary to attend perpetually; we shall perhaps be excused if, for the sake of brevity, we enter into no more similar explanations, but leave the reader to infer for himself that the same principles must have been taken along with us, and as far as human infirmity would permit must have been constantly kept in view, for the remainder of our task.

DISSERTATION XIV.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar. Cycle ii.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 1. 355 *days.*

U. C. 570 Varr. U. C. 569 Cap. U. C. 567 Polyb. B. C. 185–184.

P. Claudius Pulcher
L. Porcius Licinus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 14 B. C. 185. Nundinal Char. 5.

That this year was common may be probably concluded from the testimony of Livy[n]. The tribunician year of M. Nævius, according to the Libri Magistratuum, began December 10 Roman U. C. 569 August 25 B. C. 185, and expired December 9 Roman U. C. 570 August 14 B. C. 184; and from the tenth of December U. C. 569 to the Ides of March U. C. 570 Livy reckoned three months only: which, if correct, proves that the year of the City (U. C. 570 Varro) which was dated from the Kalends of January September 14 B. C. 185, was not intercalary.

If that was the case, it renders it only the more probable that U. C. 569, dated from the Kalends of January Sept. 2 B. C. 186, the last year of cycle i, and also U. C. 571, dated from the Kalends of January September 4 B. C. 184, the

[n] xxxix. 52: xxxviii. 56: cf. Vol. i. 519.

second year of cycle ii, must both have been intercalary; as in our arrangements it is assumed that they were.

SECTION II.—*On the date of the death of the Pontifex Maximus,* P. Licinius Crassus.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 2. 378 days.

U. C. 571 Varr. U. C. 570 Cap. U. C. 558 Polyb. B. C. 184–183.

Q. Fabius Labeo
M. Claudius Marcellus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 4 B. C. 184. Nundinal Char. 2.

Hujus principio anni P. Licinius Crassus Pontifex Maximus mortuus est[o]. He was created U. C. 542 B. C. 212[p]; so that he had been 29 consular years in office. The change in the administration of the calendar, U. C. 546 B. C. 208, and thenceforwards, took place under him; and in all probability was due to him. The fact which we lately considered in reference to the repetition of the *Ver Sacrum* B. C. 194, and the kind of scruple by which it appeared to have been occasioned[q], may fairly be regarded as a proof that the mind of this pontiff must have been peculiarly liable to be influenced by such superstitious feelings as those which led to the abandonment of the regular administration of the calendar.

Livy proceeds: In ejus locum M. Sempronius Tuditanus pontifex est cooptatus; Pontifex Maximus est creatus C. Servilius Geminus: wherein the distinction of terms, *cooptatus* in reference to the simple pontiff *creatus* in reference to the Pontifex Maximus, is observable[r].

For the illustration of the calendar however in this particular year we are most concerned with the fact which is next mentioned: P. Licinii funeris caussa visceratio data,...et ludi funebres per triduum facti, post ludos epulum. in quo cum toto foro strata triclinia essent tempestas cum magnis procellis coorta coëgit plerosque tabernacula statuere in foro. eadem paullo post cum undique disserenasset sublata: de-

[o] Livy, xxxix. 46. 45.
[p] Supra, page 30.
[q] Supra, page 84. 89.
[r] Supra, 27, note.

functosque vulgo serebant, quod inter fatalia vates cecinissent necesse esse tabernacula in foro statui.

The ingress of this consular year, March 15 Roman Dec. 7 B. C. 184, had already taken place before the death of the pontiff was mentioned. It did not therefore happen before December 7; yet it must have happened soon afterwards. The idiom of Livy, in the use of such phrases as *Principio anni* or *In exitu anni*, will seldom allow the former to be understood of a later time than the latter half of the Roman March, or the latter of an earlier than the first half. It may be taken for granted therefore that this death happened in December, B. C. 184, some time not long after the 7th of that month; and a storm, even at Rome, towards the middle or the third week of December, would be nothing extraordinary.

It is to be observed however that, in cases like this which concerned the funeral obsequies of the dead, it appears to have been the rule among the Romans that the Novemdiales Epulæ should be celebrated on the *ninth* day after the death[s]; and there is reason also to believe that for such ceremonies as these a Nundinal coincidence, if the circumstances of the case permitted it, was as much studied and preferred as on other and different occasions it was purposely avoided.

Now the Nundinal days in the Roman Martius, U. C. 571, were the 2nd, the 10th, the 18th, and the 26th. The two first preceded the ingress of the consular year, and therefore the death of the pontiff. But neither of the two latter preceded the consular ingress. It is possible therefore that the death of the pontiff might happen between the 15th and the 18th of the month; and even on the 18th itself: in which case his Ludi Funebres might begin to be celebrated on the 24th, and the Epulum by which they were followed might be given on the 26th; *on* the third day, but *after* the games; which would thus be a Nundinal day. It is to be observed that there were many *feriæ* of regular occurrence in the Roman March, later than the Ides; with which these Ludi Funebres, it may be supposed, would not be allowed to interfere: as the Liberalia, on the 17th, and the Quinquatrus from the 19th to the 23rd; which last day was the date also

[s] Vol. ii. 6, note.

of the Tubilustrium[t]. But from the 24th to the 29th the month appears to have been clear even for an extraordinary ceremony of any kind.

Now the Julian date of March 26 Roman U. C. 571 was December 18 B. C. 184. Our general Lunar Calendar, Period xiii. x. 2, shews the mean new moon of Chisleu Nov. 28 at midnight B. C. 184: and this is confirmed by the solar eclipse, October 29 at 8 P. M. Paris, the same year. December 18 March 26 Roman would be the 21st luna of that moon; and at that period of the lunar revolution and at this season of the natural year, just approaching to the winter solstice, there might be such a storm as that which Livy describes at the funeral Epulum of the late Pontifex Maximus.

SECTION III.—*On the dates of the death of* Philopœmen, *of* Hannibal, *and of* Scipio Africanus, *respectively.*

This consular year, U. C. 571 B. C. 184–183, is memorable in the general history of the time, as that of the death of the three most illustrious individuals of their day, the Grecian Philopœmen, the Carthaginian Hannibal, and the Roman Scipio Africanus the elder and the first who bore that name.

Speaking of the death of Philopœmen in particular; Ab scriptoribus rerum Græcis Latinisque, observes Livy[u], tantum huic viro tribuitur ut a quibusdam eorum velut ad insignem notam hujus anni memoriæ mandatum sit tres claros imperatores eo anno decessisse, Philopœmenem Hannibalem Publium Scipionem. Polybius was one of these Greek historians[w]; and Rutilius[x] at least was one of the Roman.

The order in which Livy mentions these deaths appears to be significant; so that we may infer from it that, if these three eminent men died in this *one* year, it was in the following order: first Philopœmen, then Hannibal, and lastly Scipio. Polybius seems to imply the same thing[y]; at least

[t] Maffæan, Prænestine, Farnesian, Vatican Calendar, apud Foggini. Ovid, Fasti, iii. 849.

[u] xxxix. 50. Cf. Diodorus, Fragm. xxix. Justin, xxxii. 4. § 9, 10. Obsequens, lix. Orosius, iv. 20. Zonaras, ix. 21. 455. C. D. Cornelius Nepos, Hannibal, ad fin.

[w] Livy, xxxix. 52. Cf. Polybius, xxiv. 9.

[x] P. Rutilius Rufus, a Tribunus Militaris under the younger Scipio at the siege of Numantia, B. C. 134: and consul B. C. 105. Cf. Appian, vi. 88. Athenæus, iv. 66: vi. 108.

[y] xxiv. 9.

if the order in which their characters are summed up and described in his extant fragments is any criterion of the order in which they passed away from the stage of history. The same remark is applicable to the order in which Diodorus also mentions their deaths.

It is well known that, with respect to the death of the last of the three, Publius Scipio, in this year in particular, Livy has raised some difficulties which imply that in *his* opinion it was a doubtful point; and yet if the testimony of Polybius was expressly given to the fact, as it appears to have been, it ought to have been competent to overrule every objection which might have been imagined to the contrary. It is not credible that Polybius, who lived so long and on such intimate terms with the grandson of Scipio himself the younger Africanus, could have been misinformed upon this point; if he did not even speak of it from his personal knowledge: for, as he was living at the time of the death of Philopœmen, and is said to have carried the urn which contained his ashes at his funeral solemnities[z], he must have been old enough to remember the death of Scipio Africanus also. The coincidence itself of three such remarkable deaths in one year carries its own confirmation along with it. It is one of those extraordinary things which would not have been found on record, unless it had actually happened. We do not ourselves therefore entertain any doubt that the deaths of these three distinguished individuals did all happen within the compass of one and the same year, reckoned by some rule and by some calendar or other; either the Roman, (either that of the city or the consular,) or the Grecian, by whichsoever of the calendar years of the Greeks in his time Polybius was most likely to have reckoned: and that in our opinion would be the calendar year of the Achæan League. Nor have we any doubt that this year of the time was one which coincided either with the Julian B. C. 184—183, or with the Julian B. C. 183—182.

That this must have been Livy's opinion also with respect to the date of the death of Philopœmen might be inferred from his own accounts[a]; and that he was under the same persuasion with respect to that of the death of Hannibal also

[z] Plutarch, Philopœmen, xxi. Polybius, xxiv. 1—4. § 16: 5—9.

[a] xxxix. 48—50: 45—48. Cf.

might be very probably collected from his proceeding to relate that[b] next to the death of Philopœmen: though he certainly gives us to understand that Valerius Antias dated the death of Hannibal the next year[c], U. C. 572 B. C. 183—182. It should be remembered however that the first and oldest authority for any statement of this kind, and one which later writers would merely repeat, must have been Polybius'; and that as the calendar by which Polybius would most naturally reckon was the Achæan, if he asserted that each of these three deaths came within the compass of some one and the same year, he most probably meant some one and the same year of that calendar: and, if this year was some one which corresponded either to U. C. 571 or to U. C. 572 of the Roman calendar, it could have been none but Period i. 40 of the calendar of the Achæan League; the limits of which were April 27 B. C. 183 and April 16 B. C. 182.

Now the death of Philopœmen in particular certainly happened after April 27 B. C. 183; for he was serving the office of prætor of the League at the very time of his death[d]: and he could not have entered on that office before April 27 B. C. 183. To judge from the context of Livy[e], the expedition in the course of which he was made prisoner could not have been going on, at the earliest, before the time of those *Legationes* and of their audience of the senate at Rome, of which he spoke just before[e], as prior to the departure of the consuls of the year to their provinces[f]. But Pausanias in particular has placed the time of the event, relatively to the natural year, out of question. Messenia, according to him, was invaded Ἐν ἀκμῇ τοῦ σίτου[g]; which would mean the month of July for that latitude in Greece: and Philopœmen himself was made prisoner on the *third* day after[h]. In July then, or at the earliest towards the end of June, may we most

[b] Livy, xxxix 51.

[c] Ibid. 56. Cornelius Nepos, Hannibal, cap. 13, gives us to understand that the death of Hannibal was dated in three different years by different authorities; U. C. 571, M. Claudio Marcello Q. Fabio Labeone, U. C. 572, Æmilio Paullo Cn. Bæbio Tamphilo, and U. C. 573, P. Cornelio Cethego M. Bæbio Tamphilo. Among these Polybius dated it U. C. 572 B. C. 183–182.

[d] Livy, xxxix. 49. Polybius, xxiv. 5. § 15—17: 9. § 1: xxv. 9. Plutarch, Philopœmen, xviii–xxi. Pausanias, viii. li. 2.

[e] Ibid. 46—48. [f] Cf. Ibid. 54.

[g] Pausanias, iv. xxix. 5.

[h] Ibid. viii. li. 2. Cf. Plutarch, Vita, xviii. xx. xxi.

probably date his death; and at 70 years of age[j], and when he had been 40 years in public life[k]: the former of which would imply that he was born B. C. 253 or 252, and the latter that he entered on public life B. C. 223 or 222. The truth is that he came into notice first at the battle of Sellasia[l]; the date of which, as we hope to shew some time or other, was on or about May 25 B. C. 222; the 19th of the first month in the Achæan calendar of that year: from which day to the 19th of the same month, May 15 B. C. 183, there were 39 years complete. So that, if he died at last any time after May 15 B. C. 183, it might truly be said that he died in the 40th year of his public life.

With regard to the death of Hannibal; it might have happened either in the course of B. C. 183, before Dec. 18 the expiration of the current consular year, or after Dec. 19 B. C. 183, but before April 16 B. C. 182, the ingress of the next Achæan year; and nevertheless might have come within the compass of the same year as that of Philopœmen. It appears from Cornelius Nepos[m] that Polybius actually dated it in the consular year of L. Æmilius Paullus Cn. Bæbius Tamphilus, U. C. 572 B. C. 183—182; and this it seems was also Valerius Antias' date of it: taken consequently from Polybius. As to the circumstances of his death, and the difference in that respect between Livy's account and that of others[n], it is a question with which we are not concerned at present.

But with regard to the death of Scipio, about which, under the circumstances of the case, there is likely to be much more uncertainty and much more difficulty than concerning that of either of the other two; if we are right in the view which we have taken of Polybius' testimony to that fact, it must have happened some time between April 27 B. C. 183 and April 16 B. C. 182; if later than the death of Philopœmen, not before midsummer B. C. 183, if later than that

[j] Livy, xxxix. 39. Pausanias, viii. li. 2. Plutarch, Vita, xviii.

[k] Polybius, xxiv. 9. § 3. Plutarch, Vita, xviii. v. Diodorus, xxix.

[l] Plutarch, Vita, v. vi. Cf. Polybius, ii. 67, 4—68, 2: 66, 6: x. 25, 6: Pausanias, viii. xlix. 1.

[m] Hannibal, cap. 13.

[n] Plutarch, Flamininus, xx. Pausanias, viii. xi. 6. Cornelius Nepos' account (Hannibal, 13) agrees with Livy's.

of Hannibal, not before the end of B. C. 183 or the beginning of B. C. 182.

The objection raised by Livy to this date of his death is founded at bottom on one matter of fact only; viz. that at the last *Senatus lectio*, B. C. 184, if Scipio was then alive, he must have been passed over, and another person must have been nominated *Princeps senatus* in his stead. We will state the objection in his own words. Scipionem et Polybius et Rutilius hoc anno mortuum scribunt. ego neque his neque Valerio adsentior[o]; his quod censoribus M. Porcio L. Valerio principem senatus ipsum L. Valerium censorem lectum invenio, quum superioribus tribus lustris Africanus fuisset: quo vivo nisi ut ille senatu moveretur, (quam notam nemo memoriæ prodidit,) alius princeps in locum ejus lectus non esset[p]. But there is nothing in this fact to set against the positive testimony of Polybius. It did not occur to Livy here[q] that Cato, the censor who nominated the Princeps senatus on this occasion, was no friend of Scipio's[r], but was the most intimate friend of Valerius; still less could he have reflected that, whatsoever was the date of Scipio's death, whether B. C. 187 or B. C. 186 or B. C. 185, he had previously abandoned public life and had gone into retirement at Liternum[s]: which was equivalent to the removal of his name from the list of senators by his own act, if not by that of any other authority.

It is far from improbable therefore that at the time of the *senatus lectio*, in which he thus appeared to have been purposely passed over, Scipio had already retired from public life; and if that can be shewn to have been the case, the objection to Polybius' date of his death, grounded on this fact merely falls to the ground. Now, as we have already explained[t], ever since the abridgment of the term of the Censorian office in U. C. 321 B. C. 433, the rule of the Censorian ingress seems to have been invariably the Kalends of Quinctilis.

[o] Valerius Antias, who dated his death U. C. 567 B. C. 188—187. Livy, xxxviii. 42—53.

[p] Livy, xxxix. 52. 56.

[q] Cf. Livy, xxxviii. 54.

[r] Cf. Plutarch, Cato Maj. iii. xi. xv. xviii. Comparatio Aristidis cum Catone, v. Dio, Fragm. lxxii. A. Gellius, iv. 18. Auctor De Viris, L. Scipio Asiaticus.

[s] xxxviii. 53. Cf. Valerius Max. v. iii. 2 De Ingratitudine.

[t] Diss. x. ch. ii. sect. i. Vol. ii. 296, sqq.

The approaching election of the last pair of censors before Cato and Valerius, viz. T. Quinctius Flamininus and M. Claudius Marcellus, is certainly first alluded to by Livy[u] U. C. 565, in the consular year of Cn. Manlius and M. Fulvius B. C. 190–189; and at the time of the sortition of provinces for that year, which could not have been long after the ingress, Nov. 8 B. C. 190: but their *actual* election is recorded, though still in this consular year, yet almost at the very end of it; between the date of the colony to Bononia[w], iii Kalendas Januarias U. C. 565, and that of the naval triumph of Lucius Æmilius Regillus the Kalends of February[x] U. C 566, followed in the next month by that of L. Scipio Asiaticus, Pridie Kalendas Martias mense interkalario[y]: the former Sept. 16, the latter Nov. 5, B. C. 189[z].

In this date of their election Livy must have been mistaken. For on that principle no part of the official year of these censors could have come in the consular year of Manlius and Fulvius, except the three last months at the utmost, the Januarius, Februarius, and Merkedonius of U. C. 566, B. C. 189. Yet it appears from Livy himself[a] that they were already in office and already discharging their official duties at Rome, when Manlius' expedition against the Gallogræci was going on in Asia; and before the proceedings of Fulvius against the people of Same in Cephallenia had yet begun. The last of these points of time, as we hope to make it appear some time or other on a future occasion, was not later than midsummer B. C. 189: but at present the only proof of that fact which we shall mention is *this*; that the siege of Same lasted *four* months[b], and that when Fulvius, soon after it was over, returned to Rome Comitiorum caussa[c], the year was *in exitu*: which in Livy seldom means a later time than the end of Februarius in a common year, or that of the Merkedonius in an intercalary year.

It is morally certain then that the election of these censors instead of happening in Januarius U. C. 566 must have happened in Junius U. C. 565. And this is confirmed by the date of their Lustral cycle; which was the lxxivth, bearing date on June 4 Roman U. C. 565 January 27 B. C. 189.

[u] xxxvii. 50: cf. xli. 9. [w] Ibid. 57. [x] Ibid. 58. [y] Ibid. 59.
[z] See supra, 113. [a] xxxviii. 28. [b] Ibid. 29. [c] Ibid. 30—35.

Their comitia would be held in that month; and they would enter upon office on the first of Quinctilis, Feb. 22. And thus they would naturally be engaged on their proper duties at Rome much about the time when Manlius' proceedings the same year were beginning.

The first thing done by new censors in general was *senatum legere:* and on this occasion, that of B. C. 189 U. C. 565, Scipio Africanus was nominated Princeps Senatus for the third time[d]. The business of this census being all concluded, the ceremony of the lustrum conditum was performed the next year[e] U. C. 566, in the consular year of C. Livius Salinator M. Valerius Messalla, not long however before the departure of these consuls to their provinces: M. Claudius Marcellus censor sorte superato T. Quinctio lustrum condidit . . . lustro perfecto consules in provincias profecti sunt[f]. The lustrum conditum was commonly held about 17 or 18 months after the ingress; which dated from Quinctilis U. C. 565 would bring us to November or December U. C. 566: the former not later than July 4 B. C. 188; about which time the consuls might be repairing to their provinces this year. Directly after too Livy passes to the proceedings of Manlius in Asia, which were those of B. C. 188; and in the spring quarter of that year, when he was commanding in quality of proconsul.

The consuls of U. C. 570 B. C. 185–184, and their election, Publius Claudius Pulcher and L. Porcius Licinus, are mentioned in their proper order[g]; and before they were yet gone to their provinces the time it appears had arrived for electing a new pair of censors also[h]: which in the event proved to be these two, M. Porcius Cato and L. Valerius Flaccus[i]. They were the censors of the lxxvth Lustrum, which bore date May 16 Roman U. C. 570 January 24 Julian B. C. 184. And the election of these censors too seems to have fallen out about the same time in the natural and the civil year on this occasion as that of their predecessors on the former occasion; viz. in the Roman month of June, the Julian month of February. For i. the dispute relating to the subrogation of a prætor, in the room of C. Decimius one of the prætors

[d] xxxviii. 28. [e] Ibid. 35. 36. [f] Ibid. 36. [g] xxxix. 32. 33.
[h] Ibid. 40: cf. 38. [i] Ibid. 40. 41: 42—44.

of the year, recently dead, does not appear to have come to an end much before the stated time of the Ludi Apollinares, Pridie Nonas Quinctiles[i]: yet that dispute was only just over, when the election of cènsors came on. If so those censors must have been elected in Junius, and must have entered in Quinctilis. ii. As soon as the Censorian comitia were over, the consuls and prætors of the year departed to their respective provinces[i], all but one, Q. Nævius; who was still detained at Rome by certain inquiries De veneficio previously going on: Secundum comitia censorum consules prætoresque in provincias profecti sunt, præter Q. Nævium, quem quatuor non minus menses priusquam in Sardiniam iret quæstiones veneficii... tenuerunt[i]. They might set out in Sextilis or September Roman, April or May Julian. And as to Nævius, it is not implied by what is observed concerning him that he was detained at Rome four months after the rest, but four months in all; i. e. from the time when these inquisitions began to be set on foot. His province was Sardinia; and it might not be too late in the year to set out for that, a month or two after the rest.

It would seem then that there is every reason to suppose that these two censors of the lxxvth Lustrum, Cato and Valerius, must have entered upon office on the first of Quinctilis U. C. 570, March 10 B. C. 184. Their first official act was the usual senatus lectio[k], when the censor Valerius himself, (no doubt by the nomination of his colleague Cato,) was chosen princeps[l]; i. e. was first designated by name to the office of senator. It must be certain from Polybius' testimony that Scipio could not yet have been dead by the month of March, B. C. 184. Consequently he must have been passed over, on this occasion, while he was still living; and yet, for all that, it would be difficult to shew that any slight was either intended him thereby, or was actually passed upon him, if before the spring of U. C. 570 B. C. 184 he had already retired from public life, and was living in privacy at Liternum, at a distance from Rome.

[i] Livy, xxxix. 40. 41: 42—44. [k] Ibid. 42. [l] Ibid. 52.

SECTION IV.—*On the probable time of the accusation of* P. Scipio Africanus *by the* Petillii *and by* Nævius; *and on the probable date of his retirement to* Liternum.

The only question then which would still require an answer would be *this*, of the probable date of his retirement, and how long it may be supposed to have preceded his death?

And here, we think, the reasoning of Livy[m] is conclusive against the date assigned, whether to his retirement from public life or to his death, by Valerius Antias, U. C. 567 B. C. 188–187 or U. C. 568 B. C. 187–186; viz. that, if a speech of P. Africanus' in answer to Nævius was still extant, he must have been still alive and still at Rome in the tribunician year of this Nævius; between December 10 Roman U. C. 569 August 25 B. C. 185 and December 10 U. C. 570 August 15 B. C. 184. There was nothing, it is true, to designate the occasion or the object of his speech but what Livy calls the Index orationis; which we may presume means the title. The name of Nævius did not occur in it. But we may suppose that the index or title was competent to declare the occasion of the speech; and therefore was a sufficient argument that it must have been delivered some time in the official year of Nævius. And though this would extend from August 25 B. C. 185 to August 14 B. C. 184; it is manifestly possible that both the accusation of Nævius, and this speeech of Scipio's in answer to it, might come in the first half of this year, as much as in the second: and therefore both in B. C. 185 itself.

It is possible therefore and even probable that the actual date of his retirement was U. C. 570; towards the end of B. C. 185 or early B. C. 184. In either case before the two censors, Cato and Valerius, had yet been elected, much less had yet entered on office. And if he died in the first half of B. C. 182, any time before midsummer that year; that would be entirely consistent with the testimony of Polybius to his dying in the same year as Philopœmen and Hannibal, though after them both. On this principle indeed he must have died only two years and a little more after his retire-

[m] Livy, xxxix. 52: cf. xxxviii. 56.

ment. But in every account of this retirement of his it seems to be implied that he did not long survive it. Valerius Antias must have been of that opinion; having related his prosecution by the Petillii in U. C. 567 B. C. 188—187, (in which Livy himself agrees with him[n],) and as Livy gives us every reason to suppose[o] his death soon after: as if he had been prosecuted and had gone into retirement in B. C. 187 and had died in B. C. 187 or 186[p]. And such too must have been the opinion of Cicero; in whose dialogue De Senectute Cato is made to say of Scipio[q], Anno ante me censorem mortuus est: and again, Novem annis post meum consulatum, cum consul iterum me consule creatus esset. As Cato was censor U. C. 570 B. C. 184, the first of these notes of time would give the death U. C. 569 B. C. 185: but as he was consul U. C. 559 B. C. 196—195, the second gives it U. C. 568 B. C. 186.

The fact of the accusation of Scipio by the two Petillii, as related by Livy after Valerius Antias[r], there is perhaps no good reason to call in question; yet it appears as if there was always a difference of opinion about *this* fact in his personal history: i.e. By whom he had been accused, and on what occasion. His accusers are sometimes represented as the two Petillii; sometimes as M. Nævius only[s]. The best mode of reconciling these different representations together is to suppose that he was twice accused, once by the Petillii and once by Nævius; and answered both accusations in person: consequently before B. C. 184 at least. There are facts on record of his personal history, even after his supposed accusation by the Petillii and his supposed retirement in consequence of it, which could not easily be reconciled with so early a date of his retirement as B. C. 187; particularly the part which he is said to have taken with reference to the proceedings instituted against his brother Lucius Scipio[t], and to the circumstances under which he is said to have betrothed his youngest daughter Cornelia to Tiberius Gracchus: which may be considered perhaps one of the best

[n] xxxviii. 50—53. Cf. Dio, Fragm. lxx.

[o] xxxviii. 53. 56.

[p] Cf. xxxix. 1. Aulus Gellius, vii. 19.

[q] Cap. 6, 19.

[r] xxxviii. 50—53. Cf. Valerius Max. iii. vii. 1 De Fiducia sui.

[s] Cf. Auctor De Viris, P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus. Plutarch, Cato Maj. xv. Livy, xxxviii. 56.

[t] xxxviii. 56: 54–56: 58–60. Livy, as if aware of this difficulty, represents these proceedings as having begun only after Scipio's death.

authenticated facts in his history. For that this daughter was actually married to Tiberius Gracchus, and yet that Tiberius also, before these proceedings against his brother Lucius, had been in some sense or other (most probably only on public grounds) the personal enemy of Scipio Africanus, cannot be doubted[u].

It follows as a corollary from these conclusions that there were only two occasions in the public life of Scipio in which that scene could actually have occurred which Livy describes in so lively a manner[w]; when, instead of defending himself against his accuser, he drew off the people, and even the attendants of the tribunes, to the Capitol, to return thanks to the gods for the signal favour which they had conferred upon the Republic, through his instrumentality, on that very day: Hoc ego die Tribuni plebis vosque Quirites cum Hannibale et Carthaginiensibus signis conlatis in Africa bene ac feliciter pugnavi[x]. From which we must infer that these proceedings were going on upon the anniversary of Zama.

The account of these proceedings is interposed by Livy[y] in the midst of the disputes relating to the triumph of Manlius[z]; after his arrival at the city yet before the actual date of *his* triumph, iii Nonas Martias[z] U.C. 568, or that of

[u] Livy, xxxviii. 57: cf. 52: 53. Cicero, xxxv. De Provinciis Proconsularibus, 8, 18. De Inventione, i. 119, 91. Polybius, xxxii. 13. § 1—7. Valerius Max. iv. i. 8 De Animi Moderatione: ii. 3 De Reconciliatione: iii. vii. 1 De Fiducia sui. A. Gellius, vii. 19. xii. 8. Pliny, Præfatio ad Titum Cæsarem, p. 12. Dio, Fragm. lxxii. Auctor De Viris, L. Scipio Asiaticus.

There are difficulties however connected with this fact also. Plutarch asserts on the authority of Polybius that Cornelia was married to Tiberius after her father's death, by the act of her other relations. Cf. Livy, xxxix. 57: Plutarch, Tib. Gracchus, i. iv. He tells us (Tiberius Gracchus, iii. Caius, i) also that Tiberius was only nine years older than Caius, and not yet 30 at his death B. C. 133: cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 6: and this would imply that he must have been born B. C. 162: 20 years after the death of Scipio, if that happened B. C. 182. It is possible that Cornelia might have been betrothed in her father's lifetime, yet not have been actually married until a good while after. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus was consul B. C. 177, and again B. C. 163, 14 years after. He could not have been less than 42 years of age at the former of these times, nor therefore less than 56 at the latter. It is very probable that he was much older than Cornelia—who survived him several years: cf. Cicero, De Divin. ii. 29, 62. Plutarch, Tib. Gracchus, i. Auctor De Viris, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus. Valerius Max. iv. vi. 1. De Amore Conjugali.

[w] Livy, xxxviii. 51. Cf. Polybius, xxiv. ix. § 6: Excerpta Vaticana, Lib. xxiv. cap. 5. Valerius Max. iii. vii. 1 De Fiducia sui. Appian, Syriaca, 40. A. Gellius, iv. 18. Auctor De Viris, P. Scipio. Plutarch, Apophthegmata, Scipio Major, x. calls his accusers Pætilius and Quintus. Cf. De Seipsum citra invidiam laudando, ix.

[x] Livy, loc. cit.

[y] Livy, xxxviii. 44—50.

[z] Ibid. xxxix. 6.

Fulvius, x Kalendas Januarias[a] U. C. 567: the latter September 3, the former November 12, B. C. 187. If this incident then really happened U. C. 567 on the Roman date of Zama, December 3, it must have happened August 16 B. C. 187; and so far Livy's representation of these proceedings would be perfectly consistent with the actual course of things in other respects the same year.

We cannot suppose that an incident like this could have occurred at the time of his accusation by Nævius *, B. C. 185: because, as the extant oration ascribed to him proved, he must have defended himself on that occasion, which he did not do when this incident happened. Yet it may very well be made a question, By what calendar did Scipio reckon the anniversary of Zama? By the Roman? or by some other which might be more agreeable to the truth? The true date of Zama was of course the Julian October 19. The Roman date December 3, which B. C. 202 coincided with October 19, B. C. 187 was coinciding with August 16. The next to the Julian, in point of accuracy, would be the equable one; that is the Punic. B. C. 202 the Punic date of Zama was Thoth 5: and B. C. 187 Thoth 5 was falling on October 15, (only four days earlier than the true date October 19,) on the Nones of February U. C. 568; the Kalends of February Roman U. C. 568, and the first of Thoth Nab. 562 B. C. 187, as it so happened being the same.

We are strongly inclined to suspect that this was in reality the true date of the scene in question: and that on this occasion Scipio purposely reckoned by the Punic and not by the Roman calendar. It is not likely that the Petillii would pitch on December 3 Roman as the date of their own proceedings against Scipio; that is, make choice of the anniversary of Zama above all other days in the Roman calendar for his accusation: and though these proceedings lasted two days[b] and this incident must have occurred on the second, yet if the second day was December 3 the first must have

* A. Gellius indeed, iv. 18, supposes it did occur on this occasion, when Scipio was accused by Nævius; and yet even he there also supposes Nævius' accusation to have arisen out of the late expedition to Asia.

[a] Livy, xxxix. 5.

[b] Livy, xxxviii. 51.

been December 2; a *dies postriduanus*, and possibly at this very time *religiosus*. It is clear too that in doing what he is said to have done on this occasion Scipio was taking his accusers by surprise, as much as the people; the best explanation of which would be that, though the day was truly the date of Zama in some other calendar, it was not so in the Roman. We will add only that the Nundinal character of U.C. 568 being 2, the Nones of Februarius were Nundinal; and a Nundinal day, when the Rustic as well as the Urban Tribes would be collected on the spot, would give so much the more solemnity and effect to the conduct of Scipio, in answering the accusation in this manner.

SECTION V.—*Date of the* Parilia, U. C. 572.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 3. 377 days.

U. C. 572 Varr. 571 Cap. 569 Polyb. B. C. 183–182.

L. Aimilius Paullus
Cn. Bæbius Tamphilus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 17 B. C. 183. Nundinal Char. 8.

Ver procellosum eo anno fuit. pridie Parilia medio ferme die atrox cum vento tempestas coorta multis sacris profanisque locis stragem fecit.....itaque in prodigium versa ea tempestas, procurarique haruspices jusserunt.

Such is Livy's account of the *spring* of this year[c]; and we might naturally enough infer from it that he must have supposed the Parilia of the year to have fallen out at their proper season relatively to the natural year: and consequently either that he was not aware of the irregularity of the calendar at this time, or, (as we consider to be most probable,) that, when he recorded the preceding occurrence, he did not reflect upon it.

For in reality, when the actual relation of the civil to the natural year at this point of time is known and taken into account, it will appear that there was nothing extraordinary even in such an incident as this; though nominally on the day before the Parilia. The Ides of March, the consular ingress, U. C. 572 bore date on December 19 B. C. 183: and Pridie

[c] xl. 2. Cf. xxxix. 56: xl. 1.

Parilia, April 19 Roman, bore date on January 23 B. C. 182: i. e. in the very depth of winter, not in the spring. The moon too, in January B. C. 182, was new on the 15th of the month; as is both shewn by our Lunar calendar, and proved by the solar eclipse, March 15 at 6 P. M. Paris, the same year: and January 23 was the date of the luna 9[a]. These things indeed could not be unknown to the people of the time; though they might be to those of after-time. If therefore the Haruspices treated such a storm as this, though in the very middle of winter, as a prodigy and as something which required to be procured, no doubt it was because of its nominal date, the Pridie Parilia; a storm proper only in the natural course of things for the most winterly day in the year, yet falling out *de facto* in this instance on the calendar date of spring.

Soon after this there is also in Livy an account of the *sollemnis lustratio* of the Macedonian army[d]; a ceremony which we may some time or other have occasion to shew had a stated date in the Macedonian calendar, Xanthicus 8: which B. C. 182 fell upon March 24. Consequently much later than the date of the Roman Parilia this same year, January 24. Nor had the consuls yet gone to their province, (Liguria[e],) when this ceremony appears to have been going on in Macedonia; and they would not take the field before April or even May. Yet news had been already received at Rome of the death of P. Sempronius[f] in Hispania ulterior[g]; after more than a year's illness passed by him[g] in the province Proprætore[h]. This proprætorian year must have lasted from the Ides of March U. C. 571, Dec. 7 B. C. 184, to the Ides of March U. C. 572, Dec. 19 B. C. 183, at least; so that the news of his death could scarcely have reached Rome prior to the Parilia, Jan. 24 B. C. 182: yet it must have done so by March 24, the date of those proceedings in Macedonia, which Livy goes on next to relate.

[a] xl. 6. Cf. 13. [e] Ibid. 1: 16. [f] Ibid. 2. [g] Cf. xxxix. 32: 38: 42. [h] Ibid. 45.

SECTION VI.—*On the relation of the civil to the natural year*, U. C. 575.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 6. 378 days.

U. C. 575 Varr. 574 Cap. 572 Polyb. B. C. 180—179.

L. Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus
Q. Fulvius Flaccus.

Kalendæ Januariæ October 1 B. C. 180. Nundinal Char. 2.

Hiems eo anno nive sæva et omni tempestatum genere fuit: arbores quæ obnoxiæ frigoribus sunt deusserat cunctas: et ea tum aliquanto quam alias longior fuit. itaque Latinas mox subito coorta et intolerabilis tempestas in monte turbavit, instauratæque sunt ex decreto pontificum [i].

Such was the natural character of the beginning of this consular year [i]. We must necessarily have inferred from this description that it entered in the middle of winter. Our calendar shews that to have been the case. The Ides of March this year fell January 3 B. C. 179. The date of the Latinæ the same year is not found on record; but whether in April Roman or in May, (any time between January 20 and March 21,) they would scarcely have fallen clear of the limits of a winter which was not only more severe than usual, but longer than usual. Could we assume that they were first celebrated this year on the v Kalendas Maias April 26 Roman [k]; that date would be greatly illustrated by our calendar: for April 26 Roman U. C. 575 coincided with February 14 Julian, only three days later than the new moon Feb. 11, the same month *. The character of the year also being 2, though April 27 Roman was Nundinal, April 26 was not so.

It is evident at least that these Feriæ were over before the

* This new moon, Feb. 11 B. C. 179, was 19 years distant from that of Feb. 11 B. C. 198, and 38 years from that of Feb. 11 B. C. 217. Both these latter, as we have seen, were ecliptic. Pingré has an eclipse Feb. 21 B. C. 180; but not Feb. 11 B. C. 179.

[i] Livy, xl. 43, 44, 45.

[k] Supra, page 16.

election of the censors who represent the lxxvith Lustral cycle, M. Æmilius Lepidus M. Fulvius Nobilior[l]; and these would come into office Quinctilis 1 April 19 B. C. 179: as is further confirmed by the fact that on one of the *two* days devoted by them to the *senatus lectio*[m], (the first official act of every new pair of censors,) the consul Fulvius departed to his province Liguria. The limits of Quinctilis U. C. 575 were April 19 and May 20 B. C. 179.

SECTION VII.—*On the Triumphs of* Fulvius Ex Hispania, *and* De Liguribus, U. C. 575 *and* U. C. 576.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 7. 355 days.

U. C. 576 Varr. 575 Cap. 573 Polyb. B. C. 179–178.

Kalendæ Januariæ October 14 B. C. 179. Nundinal Char. 8.

Livy records of this year that at the Prætorian comitia Tribus creatis comitia tempestas diremit. postero die reliqui tres facti ante diem quartum Idus Martias[n]. And this ascertains the date of the first day of these comitia, v Idus Martias, March 11 Roman.

This incident in strictness belongs to the preceding consular year; which did not expire until the day before the Ides of March U. C. 576, December 23 B. C. 179: but also to the year of the city, which began on the Kalends of January October 14 B. C. 179; i. e. to U. C. 576.

The date of these Prætorian comitia therefore was December 20 B. C. 179; and bad weather on December 20 even at Rome would be nothing extraordinary. The moon too was new December 3, as may be seen both from our General Lunar Calendar, Period xiii. x. 7, and from the solar eclipse January 2 6.45 A. M. Paris, the next month. December 20 was consequently the 18th luna. It is observable also that the Nundinal character of Martius this year being 7, the Nones (the 7th) and the Ides (the 15th) were both Nundinal; but neither the vth Idus (the 11th), nor the ivth Idus (the 12th): on which days the Prætorian comitia were held. Nor in fact any day between the 7th and the 11th; on one of

[l] Livy, xl. 45. [m] Ibid. 53. [n] Ibid. 59.

which no doubt the Consular comitia also must have been held.

The date of the triumph of the consul Fulvius, De Liguribus, which has been lost out of the Fasti, is hereby recoverable within certain limits. These comitia, as Livy tells us[o], were held *secundum triumphum*; and they came so close to the end of the year, that on this principle he must have celebrated his triumph either at the end of the Roman February or at the beginning of the Roman Martius: i. e. between December 1 and 10, or December 10 and 17, B. C. 179.

In like manner the date of his triumph De Hispania citeriore ex Prætura, which also has been lost out of the Fasti, is recoverable too: for it was celebrated on the same day (the same day of the month by the calendar) the year before as this consular triumph in this year[p]. The Consular comitia of the year before were at hand when Fulvius was waiting to celebrate this triumph. He was created consul before he triumphed; and Post paucos dies.....triumphans urbem est invectus[q]. It is here to be observed that U. C. 575 (B. C. 180—179) there was a Merkedonius, as our calendar shews; but not U. C. 576 B. C. 179—178. The date of the triumph De Hispania was either before this month or after it: and if before it, not later than the day before the Terminalia, U. C. 575. In our opinion however the most probable date of the triumph De Liguribus was a day or two before the Consular comitia U. C. 576; and that of these comitia in all probability a day or two before the Prætorian, March 11 Roman: i. e. March 8 Roman. On this principle the date of both triumphs fell between March 1 and March 8 Roman; one between March 1 and March 8 Roman U. C. 575, Dec. 20 and 27 B. C. 180; the other between March 1 and March 8 Roman U. C. 576, Dec. 10 and 17 B. C. 179: and most probably neither of them on a Nundinal day.

[o] xl. 59. [p] Ibid. 43: 30: 59. [q] Ibid. 43.

SECTION VIII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 8. 377 *days.*

U. C. 577 Varr. U. C. 576 Cap. U. C. 574 Polyb. B. C. 178–177.

C. Claudius Pulcher
Ti. Sempronius Gracchus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 4 B. C. 178. Nundinal Char. 5.

The Socii nominis Latini this year made a formal complaint to the Roman senate[r], that their own citizens, whom the Roman census at stated times summoned to Rome, were getting into the habit of settling at Rome when the census was over; and even though censed at their own homes, yet of changing their abode and migrating to Rome. This complaint went back as far as the time of the censors of the lxxivth cycle[s] T. Quinctius Flamininus M. Claudius Marcellus, B. C. 189: and it led to an edict of the senate, Qui socii... ipsi majoresve eorum M. Claudio T. Quinctio censoribus postque ea apud socios nominis Latini censi essent; ut omnes in suam quisque civitatem ante Kalendas Novembres redirent[t].

We cannot discover any connection between this date and the Lustral cycle of the time being. Nor were the Kalends of November U. C. 577 Nundinal, as the first day of the Nundinal year must have been. We conjecture that the reason for fixing on this day was simply the fact that the complaint was made and the decree of the senate was passed six months before, on the Kalends of May Feb. 20 B. C. 177.

The ingress of this consular year, the Ides of March Jan. 5 B. C. 177, was mentioned[u] before this complaint; the Principium veris and the resumption of the campaign among the Istri by the consuls of the preceding year, M. Junius and A. Manlius, after wintering at Aquileia, are alluded to after it[w]. Nor was Claudius, consul of the year, yet gone from Rome when the news of their first successes induced him to precipitate his departure[w]. Polybius shews[x] that the regular campaign under this consul began late in the summer; though one reason why it did so might be the fact that he returned

[r] xli. 8. [s] xxxvii. 50. 57. [t] xli. 9: cf. xlii. 10.
[u] xli. 8. 6. [w] Ibid. 10. [x] xxvi. 7. Cf. Livy, xli. 6.

to Rome, and left it again to take the field a second time[y], before the campaign could be said to have fairly begun. Yet even this course of things is consistent with our conjecture respecting the probable date of the complaint above alluded to; and serves to confirm it.

SECTION IX.—*On the Nundinal character of U. C.* 578.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 9. 356 days.

U. C. 578 Varr. 577 Cap. 575 Polyb. B. C. 177–176.

Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispallus
Q. Petillius Spurinus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 15 B. C. 177. Nundinal Char. 4.

The Feriæ Latinæ this year were celebrated first on iii Nonas Maias, May 5 Roman, February 13 B. C. 176[z]; and afterwards for the reason assigned were repeated. But before this second celebration of them, the consul Cornelius, who had been seized with a paralytic affection as he was returning from the Mons Albanus on the former occasion, died at Cumæ; and Petillius, his colleague[z], Conlegæ subrogando comitia habere jussus et Latinas edicere[a]; comitia in ante diem tertium Nonas Sextiles (Sextilis 3) Latinas in ante diem tertium Idus Sextiles (Sextilis 11) edixit: and the comitia were held accordingly on the day prescribed[b].

These dates are remarkable. They stand just 8 days, that is one Nundinal cycle, asunder. We may infer therefore that either both fell clear of the Nundinal day, or both fell upon it; the latter of which suppositions we should consider at this period of Roman history to be *a priori* altogether improbable.

Now the character of Januarius this year was 4. If then Februarius is supposed to have had 28 days, the iii Nonas Maias, May 5 Roman, the date of the Latinæ on the first occasion, would not be Nundinal; though the Nones (May 7) would be so: the iii Nonas Sextiles, Sextilis 3, the date of the comitia for the election of a fresh consul, and the iii Idus Sextiles, Sextilis 11, the date of the Latinæ on the second occasion, would both be the day before a Nundinal day.

[y] Livy, xli. 10. 11. [z] Ibid. 16: cf. 14. [a] Ibid. 16. [b] Ibid. 17.

Sextilis 4 would be Nundinal but not Sextilis 3; and Sextilis 12 but not Sextilis 11. And this might justly be considered a striking confirmation of the arrangements of our calendar for the present year, by the testimony of the Nundinal cycle.

It is also to be observed that the character of the year being 4, if February contained 28 days the year itself must have contained 356; otherwise the character of the next year must have been unity; i. e. the Nundinal incidence must have fallen on the Kalends of January; the very thing which the administration of the calendar at this time was expressly intended to prevent. If however Februarius had only 28 days, yet the year had 356, a day extra must have been intercalated some where or other between the last day of Februarius this year, and the first of Januarius the next year; and as we have assumed, at the end of December this year itself. It is true that means might have been devised to dispense with a year of 356 days, U. C. 578 B. C. 177–176; and yet to prevent the Nundinal incidence on the Kalends of January the next year too: not however without ultimately affecting the Kalends of January U. C. 586 B. C. 169–168; the relation of which to the Julian year is otherwise fixed, and would not admit of being disturbed. We will add only that the new consul, C. Valerius Lævinus, set out to his province Liguria on the Nones of Sextilis[c], the day but one after his election. Consequently not on the Nundinal day Sextilis 4, nor yet on the Dies postriduanus Sextilis 6. Sextilis 5 this year corresponded to May 15: a very probable time for taking the field.

Section X.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 11. 355 days.

U. C. 580 Varr. 579 Cap. 577 Polyb. B. C. 175–174.

Sp. Postumius Albinus Paullulus
Q. Mucius Scævula.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 19 B. C. 175. Nundinal Char. 6.

There is *one* hiatus in the xlist book of Livy[d], whereby the comitia and consuls of U. C. 579, B. C. 176–175, P. Mucius

[c] xli. 17. [d] Ibid. 18 and 19.

Scævula M. Aimilius Lepidus ii, have been lost out of his text at present; and another[e], through which the same misfortune has befallen both the election and the consuls of U. C. 580 B. C. 175–174, Sp. Postumius Albinus Paullulus or Paullus and Q. Mucius Scævula. The next comitia and the next pair of consuls actually found in his text are those of U. C. 581 B. 174–173, L. Postumius Albinus M. Popillius Lænas[f]. Yet the consuls of U. C. 580 B. C. 175–174 are recognized obiter U. C. 583 B. C. 171[g], as *three* years before that date; as well as those of U. C. 581 B. C. 174–173, as two years[g] before it[h]*.

It has been necessary to notice these hiatuses, because a date occurs in this same book[i] relating to the *return* of certain *legati* from Africa, the mission of whom previously is not upon record: Legati Nonis Juniis ex Africa redierunt,

* If we compare Orosius, iv. 20, with Livy, xli. 19, we shall see that xli. 19 in him belongs to U. C. 579 B. C. 176–175, the year of P. Mucius Scævula and M. Æmilius Lepidus ii: for what Orosius there relates of the fate of the Bastarnæ is in all probability only the sequel of what Livy had begun to relate xli. 19 also. And this is referred by Orosius to the winter of *that* consular year; as it is by Livy too to the winter of some year or other. P. Mucius, in fact, mentioned xli. 19, was the consul of that name this year. There is one hiatus then in Livy between xli. 18 and 19, where the comitia and the consuls elected against U. C. 579 B. C. 176–175 should have been mentioned. There is another between xli. 20 and 21 where those of U. C. 580 B. C. 175–174 in like manner should have come in too.

Compare also xliii. 2; with xli. 21; when P. Furius, (just elected xli. 21) was accused (xliii. 2): which also will prove that xli. 21 belongs to the year of Sp. Postumius and Q. Mucius U. C. 580 B. C. 175–174. Cf. also xli. 27: which shews that the year to which it belongs was censorian. Consequently B. C. 174 not B. C. 175. See also xliii. 10. 9. the Lustrum conditum of that census; a year after, U. C. 582 B. C. 173–172. Yet xli. 27 recognizes M. Æmilius as consul at the time. Consequently it must belong to U. C. 579. And as their taking the field is there mentioned also, it belongs to B. C. 175. Livy in this instance too has antedated the election of these censors June Roman, U. C. 579, instead of the same month, U. C. 580; the former March 26–April 24 B. C. 175, the latter March 16–April 14 B. C. 174. But on this principle, if xli. 21 by the testimony of xliii. 2 is determined to U. C. 580; xli. 27 in reality must be earlier than xli. 21.

[e] xli. 20 and 21. [f] Ibid. 28. [g] xliii. 2.
[h] Cf. xli. 28: xliii. 2. 28. [i] xli. 22.

qui convento prius Masinissa rege Carthaginem ierant. It must therefore have come in the lost part[i]. It is recognized in a subsequent allusion also[k] B. C. 172. We have little doubt ourselves that this date belongs to U.C. 580 B.C. 174; and in that year the Nones of June fell on March 20: by which time persons might have arrived at Rome from Africa who put to sea even in the first or second week in March.

The return of this embassy from Carthage on the Nones of June (March 20 B. C. 174) gave occasion to the mission of three legati to Greece also[l]; of course after March 20: and the time of this mission is supposed by Livy to coincide with the expedition of Perseus against the Dolopes, then going on; followed by a visit to Delphi, to consult the oracle: on which occasion he stayed there three days.

The stated time for consulting the oracle at Delphi at this period was the seventh of the month: and by the Delphian calendar B. C. 174, Period iii. Cycle vii. 1, the seventh of the third month would coincide with March 15, the seventh of the fourth with April 13, the seventh of the fifth with May 13. The latter was probably the time when Perseus was actually at Delphi; for both the expedition and the visit to Delphi seem to be so described as to have fallen out after not before the Nones of June, March 20. The visit to Delphi at least was later than the ingress of the official year of the Achæans, when Xenarchus entered on the office of prætor[m]; that is, Period i. 49, April 17 B. C. 174*.

* We will observe in reference to this year, U.C. 580, also that in Pliny, H. N. x. 16, the following statement occurs with respect to the appearance of an owl in the cella of the Capitol: Capitolii cellam ipsam intravit Sex. Palpelio Histro L. Pedanio Coss. propter quod Nonis Martiis urbs lustrata est eo anno. No such consuls as these occur in the regular series of consules ordinarii. Almeloveen however in his list of consuls alphabetically arranged has them as consules suffecti U.C. 580 upon the authority there quoted. The Nonæ Martiæ U. C. 580 fell on Dec. 21 B. C. 175, and the 5th of March was Nundinal but not the Nones.

[i] xl. 20. 21. [k] xlii. 23. [l] xli. 22. [m] xli. 22. 23. 24.

SECTION XI.—*Institution of the* Floralia.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 12. 377 days.

U. C. 581 Varr. 580 Cap. 578 Polyb. B. C. 174–173.

L. Postumius Albinus
M. Popillius Lænas.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 9 B. C. 174. Nundinal Char. 3.

The institution of the Floralia is dated by Ovid[n] in this year; though Varro according to Pliny[o] assigned it a much earlier date, U. C. 516 B. C. 238. Its stated date was iv Kalendas Maias, April 27 Roman of this time; and we will observe only that April 27 Roman this year coincided with February 22 Julian B. C. 173; and was not a Nundinal day.

SECTION XII.—*On the visitation of Locusts, U. C.* 582.

Irregular Calendar, Cycle ii. 13. 356 days.

U. C. 582 Varr. 581 Cap. 579 Polyb. B. C. 173–172.

C. Popillius Lænas
P. Ailius Ligus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 20 B. C. 173. Nundinal Char. 2.

There was a visitation of locusts in Italy this year[p]. Locustarum tantæ nubes a mari vento repente in Italiam inlatæ sunt ut examinibus suis agros late operirent[q]: and such a phenomenon as that, it might be supposed, was most likely to have happened in the spring.

There was however an allusion to something of the same kind the year before[r], when the Pomptine district was covered with a similar cloud of these insects; and that that did not occur in the *spring* may be inferred from the prodigy

[n] Fasti, v. 327—330. Cf. Livy, xli. 28: xlii. 1.
[o] H. N. xviii. 69. 3. 240. Cf. Vol. ii. 116.
[p] Livy, xlii. 9. 10: cf. xliii. 14.
[q] Ibid. 10.
[r] Ibid. 2. Cf. Obsequens, lxvii.

reported at the same time: In Gallico agro qua induceretur *aratrum* sub existentibus glebis pisces emersisse: that is, it was *seed time*, not spring, when it happened. Besides which Livy himself dates the receipt of the news of these prodigies *Principio anni*[r]; the year, i. e. of L. Postumius Albinus M. Popillius Lænas: which entered strictly on the Ides of March U. C. 581, January 10 B. C. 173, but in the æra of the city was to be reckoned from the Kalends of January, October 9 B. C. 174.

In like manner the same kind of natural phenomenon this present year, U. C. 582, appears to have occurred in the autumn B. C. 173 not in the spring B. C. 172. The duty of taking the necessary steps for the extirpation of this *pestis frugum*, as Livy terms it, was assigned to Cn. Sicinius[s]; and he was one of the prætors elected at the last comitia[t]: and he is described even then as still only prætor designatus. And though the execution of this commission took up some time[s], yet he had already returned from it before the *sortitio provinciarum*[s]; which could not have been long after the beginning of the official year.

All this implies very plainly that these locusts must have appeared in the autumnal quarter of B. C. 173, and consequently in the year of L. Postumius Albinus M. Popillius Lænas; not in that of their successors. We must suppose that they were brought by the wind from some quarter where they were liable to be generated in the spring or the summer*; most probably Africa, as they alighted first in Apulia. And as to the fruits of the ground (the *fruges*) en-

* There was a similar phenomenon in the consular year of Cn. Servilius Cæpio C. Servilius, U. C. 551 B. C. 203: Livy, xxx. 2: and the context determines that too to the same season of the year in general; the end of B. C. 203 or beginning of B. C. 202. These locusts appeared about Capua; and it was not known from what quarter they came.

Pliny (H. N. xi. 35. 325.) observes that there were two seasons for the swarming of locusts; the Vergiliarum exortus, (which would be early in May,) and the Canis ortus (which would be late in July). He adds, 327: Italiam ex Africa maxime coortæ infestant, sæpe populo ad Sibyllina coacto remedia confugere inopiæ metu.

Cf. Aristotle, De Animalibus, v. 28. Opp. i. 555.

[r] xlii. 2. Cf. Obsequens, lxvii. [s] xlii. 10. [t] Ibid. 9.

dangered by their ravages; that could not have been the corn grown up, but the corn just sprouting, or at the utmost as yet only in the blade.

There are other dates extant in this year, which our calendar is calculated to illustrate.

The consuls of the year, C. Popillius P. Ælius, had not yet departed to their respective provinces, when M. Popillius, consul of the preceding year, who had already committed one act of aggression on the Statiellates Ligures in his proper year before he went into winter quarters, which had drawn upon him the animadversion of the senate; announced by his letters a second act of the same kind still more unprovoked, and committed by him this year too when he was commanding as proconsul[u].

And that this must have been before the Kalends of Sextilis this year appears from the terms of the *Rogatio Marcia*, relating to the restitution of the captive Statielli, to which this second act of violence gave occasion; Ante Kalendas Sextiles primas: i. e. before May 16 B. C. 172 next ensuing. The consuls were not even then gone to their provinces: and meanwhile Q. Cicereius too, prætor of the year before, celebrated a triumph In Monte Albano ex Corsica; the date of which in the Fasti is the Kalends of October[w], July 13 B. C. 172. Tum demum, says Livy[x], consules in provinciam profecti sunt: not too late even then for a campaign the same season.

The contumacious proconsul M. Popillius himself did not return to the city at last Ante Idus Novembres[x]: August 25. The close of the proceedings to which he gave occasion is thus summed up by Livy[x]: M. Popillius rogatione Marcia bis apud C. Licinium caussam dixit: tertio prætor gratia consulis absentis et Popilliæ familiæ precibus victus Idibus Martiis adesse reum jussit, quo die novi magistratus inituri erant honorem: that is, December 21 B. C. 172.

We are of opinion both from the context, and from other considerations, that none of the days specified in the above accounts was Nundinal: and according to our calendar none of them would be so. Sextilis 2 was Nundinal; but not Sextilis 1. Pridie Kalendas Octobres was Nundinal, but not

[u] xlii. 21: cf. 7—9. [w] Vol. ii. 87. No lxxxiii. [x] xlii. 22.

the Kalends: v Idus Novembres was Nundinal, but not the Ides: and the next year iii Idus Martias would be Nundinal but not the Ides.

SECTION XIII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 14. 355 days.

U. C. 583 Varr. 582 Cap. 580 Polyb. B. C. 172–171.

P. Licinius Crassus
C. Cassius Longinus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 11 B. C. 172. Nundinal Char. 6.

The prætor of the year before this, Cn. Sicinius[z], the same to whom we lately alluded, whose proper jurisdiction was Inter cives et peregrinos[z], was commissioned this year by the senate to raise levies for the war with Perseus, now ready to begin, Qui Brundisium ducti primo quoque tempore Apolloniam in Epirum trajicerentur[a].

The day appointed for this rendezvous at Brundisium was the Ides of February[b] U. C. 583, Nov. 21 B. C. 172: strictly in this prætor's official year, (the consular year of C. Popillius and P. Ælius,) though in a new year of the city. Sicinius himself too set out to Brundisium apparently Pridie Idus Martias[c]; the very last day of his own year, December 20 B. C. 172.

It does not follow from these facts merely that either he or the troops assembled at Brundisium would think of crossing the sea before the spring: and it appears in reality from the date of the Feriæ Latinæ of this consular year the Kalends of June[d] that he could not have made the passage until after that day at least, March 8 B. C. 171.

The comitia for the election of the consuls of this year (those of U. C. 583) were held Exitu prope anni[e]; i. e. about xii Kalendas Martias: from which it may be inferred that there could not have been a Merkedonius that year; otherwise xii Kalendas Martias (Nov. 26 B. C. 172) must have been described as falling *mense interkalario*. The character of the year being 6, none of the days above specified was Nundinal; neither the Ides of February, nor xii Kal. Martias (Feb. 18

[z] xlii. 9. 10: cf. 28. 29. [a] Ibid. 18. [b] Ibid. 27. [c] Ibid. 36. 37. [d] Ibid. 35. [e] Ibid. 28. Cf. 25.

Roman): though xiii Kal. Feb. 17 was so. Nor were the Kalends of June the next in course Nundinal; though the 2nd of June was so.

SECTION XIV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 16. 377 *days.*

U.C. 585 Varr. 584 Cap. 582 Polyb. B.C. 170–169.

Q. Marcius Philippus ii
Cn. Servilius Cæpio.

Kalendæ Januariæ Sept. 21 B.C. 170. Nundinal Char. 8.

In this part of the history of Livy also there is an hiatus; so that the comitia against the year of the city 584 and the consuls who represent it, A. Hostilius Mancinus and A. Atilius Serranus, have been lost out of his text[g].

There can be no doubt however that their year had begun before the point of time denoted by xliii. 4[h]. Hostilius was then in Macedonia[i], and Atilius in Liguria[k]; and the time for going into winter quarters was either already come or at hand[l]. But affairs in Macedonia this year, it seems, had not gone on well: and on the report brought from that quarter to Rome by Sex. Digitius, (a Tribunus Militum, who had come home Sacrificii caussa[m],) the senate had despatched two deputies to make their own observations on the spot; with directions too to the consul Hostilius, Ut.....comitia consulibus subrogandis ita ediceret uti mense Januario comitia haberi possent: et ut primo quoque tempore in urbem rediret. Livy adds that this was done accordingly[m]: Ea uti senatus censuit sunt facta. comitia consularia ante diem quintum Kalendas Septembres fuere: and then, as he informs us, the consuls of U.C. 585 Q. Marcius Cn. Servilius were elected, and Post diem tertium the prætors also.

The v Kalendas Septembres here mentioned would be Sextilis 26 Roman U.C. 584, May 22 B.C. 170. There is consequently in the present reading of this date some corruption. Learned men have proposed to correct it by reading v Kalendas Februarias, January 26 Roman, October 16 B.C.

[g] Livy, xliii. 3. 4. Cf. 12: 11.
[h] Cf. Ibid. 5: 1: 2. Cassius was one of the consuls, U.C. 583 B.C. 172–171.
[i] Ibid. 5. (cf. 6:) 9.
[k] Ibid. 9.
[l] Ibid. 7: 9.
[m] Ibid. 11.

170. But it is equally allowable to correct it by reading Ante diem quintum Kalendas Januarias, December 26 Roman; September 17 B. C. 170: and neither that day nor September 19, December 28 Roman, would be Nundinal, though December 29 would have been so.

It does not appear that Hostilius was present at these comitia. He is mentioned as proconsul and still in Macedonia towards the end of the military season, the same year[n], B. C. 170. But there was nothing to keep his colleague from Rome except a short campaign of 60 days[o] in Liguria; so that the comitia in quæstion might be held by him even as early as September 17.

The arrival at Rome of the tribune Digitius was probably early in the spring, B. C. 170[p]: and even if it had not taken place before June or July there might still have been time to send the two *legati* to Macedonia, and to receive their official report, before the expiration of the current consular year. They returned according to Livy[q] Exacto admodum mense Februario; so critically too that there was only just time to intercalate an additional month for the sake of prolonging the official year: and even as it was not in the usual place, but Tertio die post Terminalia[q], instead of Postridie Terminalia; February 25 Roman, not February 24[r]. February consequently having already had 24 days, the Merkedonius would have only 26, yet the whole year would have 377.

This year, U. C. 585 B. C. 170—169, was censorian also; Cycle lxxviii: the date of which was April 10 Roman January 18 B. C. 169. The censors of this lustrum were C. Claudius Pulcher Ti. Sempronius Gracchus[s]. The context proves that the ingress in this instance must have been dated critically Quinctilis 1 U. C. 585 April 7 B. C. 169[t]. They had been two months at least in office[s] when they became involved in the dispute with the tribune Rutilius: and that was going on viii and vii Kalendas Octobres[t], (September 23 and 24 Roman,) June 28 and 29; not long after it had begun. On these days too the censors were put on their trial before the people: and neither of them was Nundinal.

[n] Livy, xliii. 17. Cf. 18: xliv. 1. [o] Ibid. xliii. 9. [p] Cf. Ibid. 9, 10.
[q] Ibid. 11. [r] Cf. Diss. vi. ch. i. sect. v. Vol. i. 514. [s] Livy, xliii. 14–16. [t] Ibid. 15.

The Ides of December the same year are mentioned shortly after these proceedings; and the business of the census was then going on apparently with the greatest activity: Censores censum Idibus Decembribus severius quam ante[u] habuerunt. multis equi ademti. inter quos P. Rutilio qui tribunus plebis eos violenter accusarat: tribu quoque is motus et ærarius factus[w]. He would go out of office v Idus Decembres Dec. 9 Roman, Sept. 11 B. C. 169. The Ides of December, Sept. 15, were not Nundinal; though Pridie Idus was. The end of the consular year was close at hand[x]; and we should probably have had next the date of the comitia specified, at which L. Æmilius Paullus ii and C. Licinius Crassus were elected consuls against the ensuing year, had not the text of Livy here again been defective.

To make an end of the history of this censorship, though it extends in reality to the end of the next consular year, U. C. 586 B. C. 169—168; Livy tells us that the usual indulgence of a year and two months over and above the legal term of their office[y] was denied to these censors at last through the opposition of one of the tribunes Cn. Tremellius[z]. The comitia at which the consuls of U. C. 587 Q. Ælius Pætus M. Junius Pennus, B. C. 168—167, were elected are also lost out of the text of Livy at present: but the context shews that this request must have been preferred between the expiration of the preceding year, and the beginning of this. The opposition made to it however proves that it must have been later than December 10 Roman U. C. 586. It is most probable that it was actually made on the last day of their proper official term of 18 months; Pridie Kalendas Januarias U. C. 586, October 14 B. C. 168: nineteen days after the tribunician ingress. And *that*, this year, would not be a Nundinal day.

[u] Cf. Livy, xliii. 15, 16.
[w] Livy, xliv. 16.
[x] Ibid. 17.
[y] Cf. Diss. x. ch. ii. sect. ii. Vol. ii. 304.
[z] Livy, xlv. 15.
[a] Ibid. 12—16.

SECTION XV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* ii. 17. 378 *days.*

U. C. 586 Varr. 585 Cap. 583 Polyb. B. C. 169–168.

L. Aimilius Paullus ii
C. Licinius Crassus.

Kalendæ Januariæ October 2 B. C. 169. Nundinal Char. 7.

i. *On the doubt which has been cast upon the Roman date of the battle of Pydna.*

The arrangements and details of our calendar for this year in particular ought to be considered as placed out of question by the testimony of the lunar eclipse, June 21 B. C. 168, which preceded the battle of Pydna[b]; if the Roman date at least of that eclipse, iii Nonas Septembres U. C. 586, which has been handed down, is true.

The fact of a lunar eclipse before the battle of Pydna will not be disputed; nor the date of this eclipse, June 21 B. C. 168. Nor will it be disputed that the date of the battle relatively to the natural year was at or about the summer solstice[c]. Nothing in short is *a priori* liable to be called in question except the traditionary Roman date of the battle, iii Nonas Septembres; and this has been called in question by chronologers whose opinion and judgment are deservedly entitled to very great deference and respect[d]. For the sake therefore of illustrating and confirming the truth of Roman tradition on this point, and of demonstrating the perfect congruity of the date so handed down with the entire course of circumstances before and after the battle; we shall perhaps be excused if we enter on the consideration of the chronology of this consular year somewhat in detail.

ii. *On the date of the Comitia of* Æmilius Paullus.

The comitia of the year and the election of the consuls L. Æmilius and C. Licinius are mentioned by Livy in their proper order of time[e]; only he has made a slight mistake in reckoning sixteen years, instead of merely fourteen, between

[b] Diss. xii. ch. i. sect. ii. No. vi. Page 5.
[c] Livy, xliv. 36: cf. 33. 35.
[d] Cf. the Fasti Romani of Mr. Clinton: Preface, P. xii. and ad Ann. A. Ch. N. 168.
[e] xliv. 17.

this second consulship of Æmilius and his first: for he was consul i along with Cn. Bæbius Tamphilus [d] U.C. 572 B.C. 183—182. The ingress of their year is also mentioned, the Ides of March, as usual at this time [e]; January 4 B. C. 168.

Yet there is a difficulty here *in limine*. According to Livy [f] the comitia were held when the year was *in exitu*; which in this instance would probably mean towards the end of the Merkedonius: yet the first thing done after the election of the new consuls, and while they were still only *designati*, consequently some time still before the ingress, the Ides of March, was to *allot* the provinces [g]; and Macedonia having fallen to Paullus, the next thing, (done too at his suggestion, and as it would seem not more than *two* days afterwards [g],) was to despatch deputies to Macedonia, to inquire into the course of things there during the preceding summer, and into their state at the time: and to bring back word accordingly [h].

By the Ides of March, when the new consuls entered into office, it was already known at Rome that these deputies had got as far as Brundisium on their return home [i]; and before the end of the fifth day of the Quinquatrus, (the 23d of March Roman, the Tubilustrum [k],) which Livy calls the Quinquatrus ultimæ, they had already come to Rome. Now we may venture to say that, if they had been sent on this errand only in the Merkedonius or even in the February last preceding; this return by the 23d of March Roman would have been almost impossible. There is consequently some confusion in this part of Livy's accounts; and in our opinion it lies in his having supposed the comitia of the year to have been held not long before the month of March, Roman, instead of not long before some earlier month, probably that of January.

When we consider the length of time for which the war had lasted, the unsatisfactory state of things in Macedonia, and the general uneasiness which had been excited by the little progress as yet made by successive commanders in

[d] xxxix. 56: xl. 1: cf. supra, in anno, P. 134.

[e] xliv. 19.

[f] Ibid. 17: cf. 18 where the end of the year is again alluded to after the election of the new consuls, yet when they were still only designati, and Cn. Servilius, one of the consuls of the preceding year, was still in office.

[g] xliv. 18.

[h] Ibid. 19.

[i] Ibid. 19. 20.

[k] See Vol. ii. 270 note.

bringing the contest to a close; we shall see that there would be every reason why the comitia of this year should have been held earlier than usual, rather than later. The Ides of December were mentioned just before[1]; and we think it extremely probable that the election of consuls was actually held some time between that day and the Kalends of January October 2 B. C. 169. Even after that there would be time enough left to send legati to Macedonia, who might both go thither, and make the necessary inquiries on the spot, and yet return home again by the 23d of March Roman, January 12 B. C. 168; between three and four months from the date of their mission. The mission of deputies in the year of Hostilius, B.C. 170, took place under circumstances very much the same. By this supposition every thing will be rendered consistent. Livy only will be convicted of a slight inaccuracy; and even that might possibly be explained by assuming that when he spoke of the exitus anni he intended it of the year of the city in this instance; and not of the consular year, of which the same allusion is generally intended by him in other instances.

These deputies to Macedonia having returned to Rome on March 23 Roman U.C. 586 January 12 B.C. 168; such was the general impatience to learn the report which they brought back, that, as Livy tells us[m], Nisi vesper esset extemplo senatum vocaturi consules fuerint. The Quinquatrus ultimæ or the Tubilustrian holiday would not have interfered with their doing so; nor possibly under the circumstances of the case the fact that March 23 was a Nundinal day. Perhaps however it might have something to do with preventing an immediate meeting of the senate that not only was it late in the day when these deputies arrived at Rome, but the night itself after sunset would be dark; for as our General Lunar Calendar (Period xiii. x. 17) shews the moon itself was new only the day before their arrival, January 11 B.C. 168. The senate at least was actually convoked, and the report of the messengers was received, the next morning; March 24 Roman, January 13.

[1] xliv. 16; cf. supra, p. 150.

[m] xliv. 20.

iii. *On the date of the departure of Æmilius Paullus to Brundisium; and of the Feriæ Latinæ previously.*

There is extant, as we have already had occasion to mention [n], a fragment of the Acta Diurna of the Roman senate, which belongs to this consular year. It begins only thirteen days after the ingress, v Kalendas Apriles, March 28 Roman; and it goes down to iii Nonas Apriles, April 3 Roman, six days later.

The first entry in this fragment, v Kal. Apriles March 28 Roman, is headed by Fasces penes Æmilium; the next, March 29, by Fasces penes Licinium: and so on, shewing that they had them day by day alternately. We apprehend that the rule at this time which regulated the Fasces was that neither of the consuls of a given year should hold them formally on the first day of the official year, when they first appeared in public and in state; and that afterwards the senior consul (except in particular cases) should have them first: and the senior in this instance being Æmilius it would be his turn on March 16, and again on March 28; on which latter day the Acta shew that it was. On this point however we may have occasion to speak more at large hereafter. In what manner this portion of the public journals at Rome U. C. 586 B. C. 169—168 is calculated to illustrate the Nundinal cycle of the time being has been explained [o].

The actual date of the departure of Æmilius from Rome on this Macedonian expedition is preserved in these Acta; viz. the Kalends of April. The entry on that day is Paullus consul et (C)n. Octavius præt. paludati egressi sunt urbe in provinciam Macedoniam. profecti ingent(i) atque inusitata frequentia prosequente: and this is entirely consistent with Livy's account of this departure also [p]; so much so that he might have had these Acta before him and have merely enlarged upon them.

We learnt from Livy previously that the consul was not to leave the city before the celebration of the Feriæ Latinæ [q]; and from these Acta we ascertain also that the Feriæ in

[n] Diss. vii. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. ii. 45.
[o] Ibid.
[p] xliv. 21: 22: cf. Cicero, Ad Atticum, iv. 13.
[q] xliv. 17: 21.

question were celebrated Pridie (K*.) Apriles; i. e. only the day before the departure. Livy has two dates of these Feriæ; one Pridie Idus Apriles[r], which occurs in a speech of the consul Æmilius on a former occasion: and another Pridie Kalendas Apriles[s], which occurs historically. The former is proleptical, and seems to be intended of the day for which they had been fixed at first; the latter is their actual date, the day on which they were actually celebrated: and it was probably taken by Livy from the Acta. Pridie Kalendas Apriles this year answered to January 20 B. C. 168; Pridie Idus to February 1. It is observable that U. C. 586 the former was a *Nundinal* day, which under ordinary circumstances perhaps at this time would not have been the case; but in the present instance might be purposely allowed, because of the urgency of the conjuncture, and of the importance attached to as speedy a departure of the consul as possible. If the day originally intended for these Feriæ was really Pridie Idus Apriles, 12 days later, *that* was not Nundinal. Nothing can prove more clearly that expedition and despatch was the object proposed in all these proceedings than the fact that the deputies returned from Macedonia only on the 23d of the Roman March, and made their report only on the 24th, and yet the consul and prætors, who had been waiting for their return and their report, were already on their way to their provinces on the first of April afterwards.

We learn too from the testimony of these Acta, that on the day after the departure, iv† Nonas Apriles, a *Ver sacrum* was vowed *ex pontificum sententiâ*, by Bæbius (the Prætor urbanus[t];) of which Livy makes no mention, nor of its fulfilment at any subsequent time. And this may possibly authorize the inference that this kind of vow might have been of much more frequent occurrence, (especially in time of war, and at critical conjunctures in the course of a particular war, like the present,) than would be supposed from the contemporary history in general. April 2 Roman on this occasion would

* The letter K here is inserted from the necessity of the case.

† The characters iv here too are restored from the necessity of the case.

[r] xliv. 19. [s] xliv. 22. [t] Cf. xliv. 17.

not be Nundinal; but it would be a *Dies postriduanus*: and that too would seem to imply that if it was purposely selected to be the date of the conception of such a vow and such an obligation as this, (an act of religion to all intents and purposes, and of good omen,) it could not yet have been regarded as *religiosus*, or *ἀποφράς*, like the day after the Ides.

iv. *On the date of the passage from Brundisium; and on that of the arrival at the army.*

The date of the departure then both of the consul and of the prætor of the year appointed to the service in Macedonia having been thus determined to the Kalends of April; did we know no more about it than that fact merely, we might naturally enough have concluded that they were setting out in the spring, at the most proper time imaginable for assuming the command, the one by land the other by sea: and therefore that they must actually have crossed the sea very soon after. In this case from the known length of the entire campaign, and in particular that of the interval between the arrival of the consul at head-quarters and the battle; it would have been absolutely impossible that the battle could have been fought at last so late in the Roman year after the Kalends of April as September 4. And no doubt this consideration as much as any thing has hitherto served to discredit this date.

But in fact the Kalends of April this year, instead of coinciding with any Julian date in or near to the month of April, did in reality coincide with January 21 B. C. 168: and as Livy himself observed on a former occasion[u] no Roman commander had yet been bold enough to think of crossing the sea even from the coast of Italy to the opposite one of Epirus at that season of the natural year. In fact we have seen instances of the appointment of the troops, intended for service in Greece, to assemble at Brundisium on the Ides of February[w], when February was coinciding with November; and on the Ides of May[x], when May was coinciding partly with December partly with January; and on the Ides of Quin-

[u] xxxviii. 41: of Manlius, wintering at Apollonia. [w] Supra. 147 B. C. 172.
[x] P. 98. B. C. 192—191.

ctilis[y], when Quinctilis was coinciding with March: and yet in none of these instances was the sea actually crossed before the spring was far advanced. No inference then can be drawn in such cases as these from mere nominal coincidences between Roman and Julian dates. The actual course of things in a particular instance must be determined by circumstantial evidence. It is clear from the context of accounts on all these occasions that, howsoever early the armies of the republic and their commanders might be assembled at Brundisium, ready to take advantage of the first opportunity of putting to sea; the passage was never actually made before a certain time in the natural year, otherwise the most suitable for it: and seldom as early as April, more generally only in May.

The case of Æmilius Paullus, and this expedition of his to Macedonia, B. C. 168, are no exception to this general rule. Jam veris principium erat, says Livy[z], novique duces in provinciam venerant, consul Æmilius in Macedoniam, Octavius Oreum ad classem, Anicius in Illyricum. And this is confirmed by a subsequent allusion[a]: Perseus quoque quum *adventu consulis* simul et *veris principio* strepere omnia moverique apud hostes . . . cerneret. The actual date of the passage then was the *Principium veris;* which in the idiom of Livy commonly means the month of May.

It is however in our power to determine the very day of the passage with certainty; assuming only that the date of the battle at last was the day after the eclipse, June 22.

There is no fact in the history of this Macedonian campaign of U. C. 586, about which the Roman historians are more agreed, than that of the shortness of its duration compared with its decisiveness, and the magnitude of its results. Let us hear Æmilius Paullus's own account of it, as given, according to Livy[b], the next year at Rome Pro concione, a few days after his triumph, Sept. 2–4 B. C. 167.

Profectus ex Italia classem a Brundisio sole orto solvi: nona diei hora cum omnibus meis navibus Corcyram tenui: inde quinto die Delphis Apollini pro me exercitibusque et classibus lustra sacrificavi: a Delphis quinto die in castra

[y] P. 97 B. C. 191—190. [z] xliv. 30. [a] Ibid 34. [b] xlv. 41.

perveni . . . et quod bellum per quadriennium quatuor ante me consules ita gesserant ut semper successori traderent gravius id ego quindecim diebus perfeci.

Plutarch[c] and Appian[d] repeat these statements. It appears to us however that Diodorus' account[e] of the movements of the consul from the time when he set sail to the end of the campaign was as carefully considered as any. We shall therefore compare that with the above from Livy; adding ourselves the true Julian dates of the days specified by him.

B. C. 168	May 30	The consul was at Corcyra	First day at the ninth hour.
	June 3	He was at Delphi	The fifth day after.
	.. 8	He arrives at the camp in Macedonia	Five days after.
	.. 22	Pydna was fought ..	On the fifteenth day after.
	.. 26	All Macedonia submitted	Four days after.
May 30—June 26			Twenty-eight days inclusive of both.

The interval of four days from the battle to the total submission of Macedonia may be made out from Livy also[f]. The date of the battle being given, June 22, that of this submission must have been June 26: from which if we subtract twenty-seven days, we get the date of the departure from Brundisium May 30; and every thing else accordingly *.

* It is in our power to confirm one of the above dates, that of the sacrifice at Delphi June 3, by the testimony of the Delphian calendar. The stated date for the consultation of the oracle at this period, as we observed supra, was the seventh of every month; and that being the case, no day could be more proper *a priori* for offering sacrifice to Apollo on the spot, than the seventh of the month: which itself was traditionally sacred to Apollo, as the day on which he was supposed to have been born. It is not indeed asserted by any of our authorities that the Roman consul consulted the oracle on this occasion; and consequently we cannot undertake to vouch for that fact also. Still we apprehend it will be a strong confirmation of the Julian date of this visit of his to Delphi, June 3, if it

[c] Æmilius Paullus, xxxvi.
[d] ix. Ecloga xvii.
[e] SS. Vaticani, ii. p. 82, 83: Excerpta Diodori, xxxi. 6.
[f] xliv. 43—45. Cf. Plutarch, Æmilius, xxiv. who supposes only two days.

v. *On the date of the battle of Pydna relatively to the natural year.*

It is clear from Livy[g] that the date of the battle of Pydna in the natural year was midsummer; and this is a point which we may have occasion to illustrate more at large hereafter. Plutarch indeed just before the battle observes, Θέρους γὰρ ἦν ὥρα φθίνοντος[h]: which would properly define the time denoted by the φθινόπωρον of the Greek calendar; the beginning of September in the Julian. It is easy therefore to account for this observation of *his*, without prejudice to the truth, by supposing that he was thinking of the Roman date of the battle Sept. 4, and in the calendar of his own time: but not in that of *this* time. He too recognizes the eclipse before the battle[i]; the true Julian date of which, June 21, if known to him, on the least reflection must have appeared totally at variance with such a season in the natural year as the φθινόπωρον of the Grecian calendar.

It is agreed that the battle was brought on at last unexpectedly, and late in the day; i. e. at or after the *ninth* hour only[k]: and that it continued until late at night[k]. Plutarch mentions the return of the Romans from the pursuit (which had carried them to a distance of 120 stades from the field of battle) Ἑσπέρας ἤδη βαθείας: as well as supper-time even after that: when too it was discovered that Æmilius' youngest son, the Scipio Æmilianus of after-times, whom the ardour of pursuit had taken too far from the camp, had not yet come back[l]. These circumstances are characteristic of the longest day for such a meridian as that of Pydna, such as would be

can be shewn that it coincided with the seventh of the current Delphian month.

The Delphian calendar at this time was still octaëteric. But the octaëteris had its proper period of 160 years. The third period of this kind at Delphi bore date January 9 B. C. 222: and B. C. 168 in that period answered to Cycle vii. 7. In *this* year of the cycle and at this time the date of the vith month was May 28; and therefore that of the seventh of the sixth month was June 3.

[g] xliv. 36: cf. 33. 35.
[h] Æmilius, xvi.
[i] Ibid. xvii. xviii.
[k] Livy, xliv. 37–40–42. Plutarch, Vita, xviii. xix. xxii.
[l] Cf. Livy, xliv. 44. Polybius, xxxii. 15. Diodor. Fr. xxx. Auctor De Viris, Scipio Æmilianus.

the case at midsummer; and yet of a dark night too—for the soldiers and attendants of Paullus are spoken of by Plutarch on the same occasion as running about in search of Scipio by the light of lamps and torches. On the night of the day after a solar eclipse, it would be dark before midnight even at midsummer, for the meridian of Pydna.

vi. *On the date of the arrival of the news of the battle of Pydna at Rome.*

The mission of Legati to Rome by the consul with the news of his victory, and on one of the days of the Quatriduum between the battle and the submission of Macedonia, is mentioned by Livy[m]; one of them his own son[n], Quintus Fabius, so called because he had been adopted into the Fabian family, the other two L. Lentulus and Q. Metellus. But the report of the victory had reached Rome even before their arrival; in fact almost before they had been sent. Quarto post die, says Livy[o], quam cum rege est pugnatum, quum in Circo ludi fierent; murmur repente populi tota spectacula pervasit: pugnatum in Macedonia et devictum regem esse. Others of the ancients repeat this statement[p]; and extraordinary as it may seem, yet that such a report was raised and at this time even in Rome itself appears to be a well-authenticated matter of fact. Nor, as we observed before on a somewhat similar occasion[q], are instances wanting of the same unaccountable transmission of the news of great and important events; or of similar coincidences between an accidental report howsoever occasioned and an actual matter of fact[r] *.

* It should be observed, in reference to the above fact, that this bruit or rumour of the victory howsoever excited on the fourth day after the battle of the fact. So the victory at Sagra in Italy—heard of at Olympia the same day; (Plutarch, Æmilius, xxv. Justin, xx. 3. § 9. Parœmiographi Græci, Zenobii Prov. Cent. ii. 17. p. 257, 258: Gaisford, Oxon. 1836.)—The victory at the Lacus Regillus, announced at Rome the same day: (Dionysius Hal. vi. 13.)—Marius' victory over the Cimbri: (Pliny, H. N. vii. 22. Florus, iii. iii. 20, 21.)—Antonius' death in Germany, in the reign of Domitian: (Plutarch, Æmilius Paullus, xxv.)

[m] xliv. 45: xlv. 1.

[n] Cf. xlv. 27. Polybius, xxix. vi. § 3. Plutarch, Æmilius Paullus, v. Velleius Pat. ii. 10.

[o] xlv. 1.

[p] Plutarch, Æmilius Paullus, xxiv. Zonaras, ix. 24. 459 D.

[q] Supra, page 45. B. C. 207.

[r] Platææ and Mycale are well known examples of this kind. Cimon's victory at the Eurymedon in Pamphylia is said to have been heard of at Athens the same day, and an altar to Φήμη to have been erected there in commemoration

The fourth day after the battle would be September 7 Roman, June 25 Julian; and the consistency of this date of the first rumour of the battle as heard of at Rome with that of the battle appears from the fact that September 7 was actually one of the stated days of the Ludi Magni, Ludi Romani, or Ludi Circenses, which latter games Livy says were going on at the time: for these games in the Julian calendar of after-times began Pridie Nonas Septembres and lasted to Pridie Idus[s], from September 4 to 12. The arrival of the Tabellarius indeed, who brought the *litteræ laureatæ*, the official despatches of the consul, was announced Ante diem decimum Kalendas Octobres, ludorum Romanorum secundo die[t]; just as the consul Licinius was going to start the chariots. Tertius decimus dies erat, says Livy[t], ex quo in Macedonia pugnatum erat. If that was correct the messenger arrived September 17, xiv Kalendas Octobres, at the latest: and even

must have been a different thing from the reported appearance of Castor and Pollux to a certain P. Vatinius or Vatienus; which is said to have happened on the night of the battle itself. Cicero and Valerius Maximus[1] have left the most circumstantial account of this particular occurrence; only that what was thus made known to Vatienus by the appearance in question is supposed by them to have been the capture of Perseus, not the victory of Pydna: between which two events there was probably a good many days' interval. We learn also from these accounts the site of the Ædes of Castor and Pollux at Rome at this time: and that it was said to have opened of its own accord on the same occasion.

This supposed appearance of Castor and Pollux must have taken place on the night of September 4, June 22. Livy is silent about it; and so also is Plutarch. Yet possibly on this fact might be ultimately founded the rumour of the victory on the fourth day after. The senate indeed must have imprisoned Vatienus at first, for announcing such an occurrence; though they rewarded him for it in the end: and perhaps must have attempted at first to suppress the fact of what he had announced, and to prevent its being spread any further. It was of the nature however of such a thing to get abroad; and men's ears, no doubt, waiting in anxious suspense for news from Macedonia, were open to the slightest whisper of that description.

[1] Cicero, De Natura Deorum, ii. 2. 6: iii. 5, 11. 13. Valerius Maximus, i. viii. 1 De Miraculis. Cf. Pliny, II. N. vii. 22. Florus, ii. 12. § 14–16. Minucius Felix, vii. 3. Lactantius, ii. 7.

[s] Maffæan, Amiternine, Capranic, Antiatine, and Pincian Calendars, apud Foggini. [t] xlv. 1.

that, in the Julian calendar of after-time, was one of the stated days of Ludi in Circo, viz. *the last but one.* The x Kalendas Octobres, in the Julian calendar at least, was no such day at all. Besides if the messenger actually arrived on the x Kal. Octobres, September 21, yet *on* the thirteenth day from his mission, he must have been sent on the 9th; and that would have been later even than the mission of the three legati alluded to supra. We cannot doubt however that the bearer of the *litteræ laureatæ* of the Roman general, the bearer of the official despatches of the consul, must have been the first person sent to Rome after the battle. We conclude therefore that in the date of Livy above quoted, Ante diem decimum Kalendas Octobres, there is an omission which ought to be supplied by reading ante diem decimum *quartum* Kalendas Octobres.

This messenger, (an Hemerodromus, no doubt, or courier, who would travel post,) might reach Rome from Pydna even in 13 days' time. The legati above mentioned arrived vi Kalendas Octobres[u], September 25 Roman, eight days later; and as they too were certainly sent between Sept. 4 and 8, June 22 and 26, they were probably 19 days on the road: or possibly only 17—if they brought the news of the submission of Macedonia also. That such a journey could be accomplished in the summer time in 17 days without using any extraordinary degree of exertion, we hope to prove some time or other by a number of cases in point[w].

A supplication or thanksgiving of five days' duration was decreed in consequence of these tidings: Subplicatio pro concione populi indicta est ex ante diem quintum Idus Octobres cum eo die in quinque dies; i. e. from October 11 inclusive to October 15 inclusive: besides which, on the receipt of the news also of the successes of the prætor Anicius in Illyricum, soon after either a fresh thanksgiving or an instauration of the Feriæ Latinæ was appointed for the iv iii and Pridie Idus Novembres[u]: Nov. 10—12 inclusive. All these dates are consistent, according to the calendar as it stood at the time. There is no reason to suppose that Anicius took the field earlier than Æmilius Paullus had done[x]; and as the

[u] Livy, xlv. 2, 3. [w] Cf. also our Dissertations, &c. iii. 382 sqq. App. Diss. viii. [x] Livy, xliv. 30: xlv. 3. 43.

campaign in Illyricum took up 30 days[y], twice the time of that in Macedonia, his legati would arrive at Rome, announcing its successful termination, so much later than those of Paullus.

vii. *On the tour of* Æmilius Paullus *in Greece, B. C.* 168; *and on the date of his Games, B. C.* 167.

Among the remaining events both of the last half of B. C. 168, and of the first half of B. C. 167, (Æmilius Paullus' proconsular rather than his consular year,) the most interesting are his tour in Greece, B. C. 168[z]; and the games which he celebrated at Amphipolis, in B. C. 167. Of each of these in its turn.

The tour was begun in the autumn of B. C. 168; Auctumni fere tempus erat[a]: and from the time of the surrendry of Perseus[b] the army had been already disposed in winter quarters[c]; the date of which surrendry may be conjectured from the fact that the consul's letters, announcing that last piece of news from the seat of war, were received at Rome[d] only just before the comitia of the year[e]: very probably not long before the Kalends of January October 15, the close of the censorian term of office, of which we had occasion to speak *supra*[f]. These letters of Paullus then were probably sent in the latter half of September. The army consequently would go into winter quarters about the autumnal equinox. In the consul's absence, C. Sulpicius Gallus (the astronomical tribune of that name no doubt) was appointed to command it[g]. The tour then would not begin before the autumnal equinox. Q. Maximus, the consul's son, one of his legates to Rome on the former occasion, had returned before it was undertaken[g]; and that might well be the case by the end of September.

The first place which he visited was Delphi: and he again offered sacrifice there[h]; but nothing is said about his consulting the oracle also. We should conjecture that he was pro-

[y] Livy, xliv. 32. Eutropius, iv. 3. Appian, Illyrica, 9, says 20 days.
[z] Livy, xlv. 27, 28. 32, 33. Plutarch, Vita, xxviii.
[a] Livy, xlv. 27.
[b] Ibid. 5–8.
[c] Ibid. 9.
[d] Ibid. 13.
[e] Ibid. 14. 15.
[f] Page 150. Cf. Livy, xlv. 15.
[g] xlv. 27.
[h] Ibid. Polybius, xxx. 15. Plutarch, Vita, xxviii.

bably there on this second occasion between the 1st and the 7th of the xth month, September 23 and 29. The name of this was Ἀποτρόπιος; and from that month forward to the end of the Delphian year the oracle was reckoned to be shut: though that would be no reason why sacrifice to the Delphian Apollo might not be offered on the spot any time in those three months. The ixth month, August 25—Sept. 23, would probably be too early; the xith, October 23 to Nov. 21, would probably be as much too late.

A visit to Athens[i], and Paullus' sacrificing there to Minerva πολιοῦχος, are next mentioned before his departure to Corinth[k]. But no allusion occurs to the mysteries; from which we may infer that those of this year were over before he came to Athens. In fact the first of Boëdromion this year fell on Sept. 8, and the mysteries Sept. 21–29; when Paullus was probably at Delphi.

When the tour was just over, and he was returning to Demetrias, (where he appears to have passed the winter,) a complaint was made to him by the Ætolians, or by some part of them, respecting certain acts of violence lately committed towards them by Lyciscus and Tisippus, heads of the party among them which had espoused the cause of the Romans in the late war with Perseus; in which acts too they had been abetted by the Roman Præfectus classis Bæbius[l]. This complaint was certainly later than the ingress of the Ætolian year: October 4 B. C. 168.

It was previously mentioned by Livy[m] that, upon the receipt of the last despatches from Æmilius, a council of ten was deputed to Macedonia, which was to assist him in the final settlement of the affairs of that country. Not however before the ingress of the next consular year, the Ides of March U. C. 587 Dec. 24 B. C. 168. The arrival of these commissioners was announced to Paullus while he was still at Demetrias[n]; and he went himself to Apollonia to meet them. They would probably arrive at Apollonia about the same time this year as he had done the year before; or not much earlier: that is, in May B. C. 167. The Achæan year, at

[i] xlv. 27, 28.
[k] xlv. 28.
[l] xlv. 28. 31. Called here A. Bæbius. Consequently a different person from Cn. Bæbius, xlv. 17. Cf. Polybius, xxx. 10. § 4: 11.
[m] xlv. 16. 17.
[n] xlv. 28. Plutarch, Vita, xxviii.

least, appears to have commenced before their arrival[o]; and that would not be the case before April 28.

To go however from Amphipolis to Apollonia and to come back from thence in company with this commission would probably require the best part of a month[p]: so that the settlement of Macedonia and other preliminaries after this return to Amphipolis could not well be over before the month of June or July the same year. It is after all these things only that the account of the games of Paullus comes in[q]. For these games he had been making preparations all the time that he was engaged on his tour. It is here to be observed that B. C. 168 was an Olympic year, Olymp. cliii. 1; but the stated date of the games that year was July 20–25: a month after Pydna, and a part of the year of the proceedings of which we have no account in Livy. It is clear from the context of the narrative hitherto that Paullus was selecting for his games the last half of this first year of Olympiad cliii. 1, the first half of B. C. 167; and we may observe that the first year of the Olympic cycle is precisely that one in which none of the rest of the games of the Περίοδος, as it was called, the Pythian, Isthmian, or Nemean, whether in the summer or in the spring, would also be in course; and therefore likely to interfere with these of the Roman proconsul.

As to their date; it is not improbable that they might be celebrated on the anniversary of Pydna, June 22, B. C. 167; but we think it still more probable that, being intended in imitation of the Olympic games, they were celebrated at the same time in this second year of the cycle as the Olympia usually were in the first: and that, in conformity to the Olympic rule and the Olympic calendar, B. C. 167, would be July 10–15. There is nothing to object to this date from the course of subsequent events. The march from Amphipolis to Passaro in Epirus, after the games were over, took up only twenty-one days, and the direption of Illyricum only two more[r]. Paullus' triumph was celebrated at last September

[o] xlv. 31. Polybius, xxx. 10. § 3–8. 11.

[p] Cf. xlv. 33.

[q] xlv. 29–33: Epitome, li. Plutarch, Vita, xxviii. Polybius, xxxi. 3.

[r] Livy, xlv. 33. 34. Polybius, xxx. 15. § 5. Appian, Illyrica, 9. Pliny, H. N. iv. 17. p. 88. Eutropius, iv. 4.

2–4; to the first of which dates from July 15 the last day of the games there would still be 49 days, for the transaction of intermediate events.

viii. *On the dates of the Triumphs of* Æmilius, Octavius, *and* Anicius *B. C.* 167, *respectively.*

There are yet other proofs of the truth of our calendar for the remainder of this second cycle, B. C. 168–161, which might be produced, if necessary. But we may very well dispense with any more.

We will observe only that the date of Paullus' triumph and of that of Octavius, arising out of this Macedonian war, is extant in the Fasti Triumphales, as well as in Livy[s]; both in the same year of the city, which began Kalendas Januarias U. C. 587, October 15 B. C. 168, Nundinal Char. 5: the former proconsule, iv iii and Pridie Kalendas Decembres, Sept. 2, 3, 4 B. C. 167; the latter proprætore, Kalendis Decembribus, Sept. 5, the day after Paullus'. The last day of Paullus' triumph was Nundinal. But it did not begin on a Nundinal day.

There was a third triumph arising out of the military proceedings of B. C. 168 also; that of L. Anicius Gallus, for the successes in Illyricum, proprætore too: and this was celebrated on the Quirinalia[t] Merkedonius 16 (the year being intercalary) U. C. 588, December 10 B. C. 167; consequently in a different year of the city from the other two, though still in the same consular year. Neither did this triumph fall on a Nundinal day.

That this year was intercalated, and in the usual place, Postridie Terminalia, was attested by Livy[u]; about the time too of the comitia when C. Sulpicius Gallus M. Claudius Marcellus, who represent U. C. 588 in the Fasti, B. C. 167—166, were elected consuls[u]. The same fact is ascertained of the next year, U. C. 589 B. C. 166—165, by the dates of the triumphs of these consuls; which though wanting in Livy are extant in the Fasti[w]: one of them, Marcellus', most probably before the intercalary month; the other, Sulpicius',

[s] Vol. ii. 87. No. lxxxiv. i. ii. Livy, xlv. 35–42. 16. 14. 15.

[t] Livy, xlv. 43. Vol. ii. 87. No. lxxxiv. iii.

[u] xlv. 44. Cf. Polybius, xxx. 16. 17.

[w] Vol. ii. 88. No. lxxxv. ii.

x Kalendas Martias, Merkedonius 20, Dec. 26 B. C. 166: and this too fell clear of the Nundinal day.

We must not be surprized to see several intercalary years in succession about this time. We have proof to produce that U. C. 601 the Kalends of January were falling Dec. 28 B. C. 154: and if B. C. 169 they were falling on October 2, as is proved by the eclipse before Pydna, it is self-evident that from B. C. 169 to B. C. 154 they must have mounted upwards at a rapid rate. And that would imply a frequent use of the intercalary month in the course of these fifteen years.

DISSERTATION XV.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar. Cycle iii.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iii. 8.378 *days.*

U. C. 601 Varr. 600 Cap. 598 Polyb. B. C. 154–153.

Q. Fulvius Nobilior
T. Annius Luscus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 28 B. C. 154. Nundinal Char. 2.

As the first thing which we propose to do in illustration and confirmation of the third cycle of the irregular calendar; we shall proceed to lay before the reader the proof of the assertion just now made; viz. That B.C. 154, in the 8th year of this cycle, the Kalends of January had got up to December 28: which was only one day behind December 29 the stated epoch of the same Kalends in the first year of the regular cycle of the calendar, the Decemviral. Of this fact the demonstration which we have to offer is singularly curious and interesting; and not the less so because it is new, and such as has hitherto escaped the learned. And we may add that it is not more curious and interesting than conclusive and satisfactory.

i. *On the astrological calculation of the date of the Foundation of Rome by* L. Tarutius. *Testimonies.*

The attempt which was made to solve the problem of the date of the birth of Romulus and of the date of the founda-

tion of Rome on the principles of the judicial astrology of antiquity must be well known to all who have read Plutarch's Life of Romulus. The person who proposed this problem for solution was the learned Varro; the person who undertook to solve it was L. Tarutius, or Tarrutius, Firmanus, a contemporary and friend of his as well as of Cicero and his brother Quinctius. Tarutius is one of the authors quoted by Pliny[x]; and he too gives him an high character for his proficiency in astrology (which at this time meant astronomy) and in such calculations as these: Mathematicus nobilissimus qui Græce de astris scripsit.

Let us begin with producing the testimonies to this calculation. The earliest extant either to the calculation itself or to the result to which it led is Cicero's. L. quidem Tarutius Firmanus familiaris noster, in primis Chaldaïcis rationibus eruditus, urbis etiam nostræ natalem diem repetebat ab iis Parilibus quibus eam a Romulo conditam accepimus; Romamque in Jugo cum esset luna natam esse dicebat: nec ejus fata canere dubitabat[y].

The date of this dialogue was next to that of the dialogue De Natura Deorum; and the date of that, as well as of most of the Philosophica of Cicero in general, was B. C. 45 or 44, not long before or not long after the death of the Dictator Cæsar[z]. The calculations of Tarutius therefore had come to be generally known by B. C. 45. It may be confidently inferred from this account of them, that he must have been of the common opinion that Rome was founded at the Palilia; that he must have supposed the Palilia to have been in existence in the time of Romulus, and nothing different from the Palilia of his own time: that he must have cast the nativity of the city for that day, and found it to answer for that day. And, though nothing is here said about the sun's place at the time of the foundation and on this day, the moon's place on the same day and at the same time, according to his calculation, is distinctly attested; and is set forth as some day when the moon was in the Scales, (Jugum, Ζυγὸν,) or Libra.

[x] Index ad Libr. xviii. [y] De Divinatione, ii. 47, 98. [z] Cf. i. 4, 8: ii. 1–2.

ii. The next testimony in point of time would be that of Manilius.

> Hesperiam sua Libra tenet, qua condita Roma
> Urbis in imperio retinet discrimina rerum,
> Lancibus et positis gentes tollitve premitve,
> Et propriis frænat pendentem nutibus orbem :
> Qua genitus cum fratre Remus hanc condidit urbem [a].

The foundation of Rome in Libra appears to be asserted here too; and as Tarutius was certainly older than Manilius, and according to Cicero determined the foundation to some time when the moon was in Libra also, there would seem to be no reason why thus much at least of the preceding statements should not be supposed to have been founded ultimately on the calculations of Tarutius. And yet, if Tarutius (notwithstanding the testimony of Cicero apparently to the contrary) did not date the foundation even when the moon was in Libra, this statement of Manilius also may have been entirely independent of *his* calculations. The apparent inference from the above passage is that the city was founded when the sun was in Libra; and that would be a very different thing from the moon's being in Libra: unless the sun and the moon were in conjunction at the time. Another opinion too seems to be implied in this testimony of Manilius; viz. That Romulus and Remus were born in Libra: and that is an opinion which, as we shall see by-and-by, could not possibly have been entertained by Tarutius. Upon the whole therefore it is doubtful whether this passage of Manilius does not express only his particular opinion on these points; and not the traditionary belief, founded on the supposed results of the calculations of Tarutius.

iii. The next account of these calculations would be Plutarch's; but we reserve that for the present. The next to Plutarch's is Solinus's [b]: Ibi Romulus mansitavit, qui auspicato fundamenta murorum jecit duodeviginti natus annos undecimo Kalendas Maias hora post secundam ante tertiam plenam: sicut Lucius Tarruntius prodidit, mathematicorum nobilissimus; Jove in Piscibus, Saturno Venere Marte Mercurio in Scorpione, Sole in Tauro, Luna in Libra, constitutis.

[a] Astronomica, iv. 773. [b] Polyhistor, i. 18.

Here we have many astronomical characters of the time in question, all specified on the same authority of Tarutius; the most important of which for our purpose are the two last, the sun's being in Taurus, and the moon's being in Libra. And as this last criterion of the time, and as so determined, is in unison with Cicero's statement concerning the place of the moon on the same authority; it is so far an argument that the place of the sun, as here specified also, is agreeable to the same calculations; and is such as Tarutius actually made it.

iv. The testimony of Joannes Lydus is the next which is found on record after that of Solinus. Ῥωμύλος δὲ κτίζει τὴν Ῥώμην τῇ πρὸ δέκα μιᾶς καλανδῶν Μαΐου, κατὰ τὸ τρίτον (ἔτος) τῆς ἕκτης (Ὀλυμπιάδος), ἢ ὡς ἕτεροι, κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον τῆς ὀγδόης· ἡ δὲ ὥρα τῆς πόλεως ὥρα δευτέρα πρὸ τρίτης, ὡς Ταρρούτιος ὁ μαθηματικὸς κατεστήριξεν, Ἡλίου μὲν Ταύρῳ, Σελήνης δὲ Παρθένῳ, Κρόνου δὲ Ζυγῷ, Διὸς δὲ Λέοντι, Ἄρεος Ζυγῷ, Ἀφροδίτης Ταύρῳ, Ἑρμοῦ Κριῷ[c]. And though this testimony is the latest in point of time which is any where extant, so far as we know, and though it differs in some of its particulars from that of Solinus last quoted; we are strongly inclined to believe that it contains the most correct account of the actual calculations of Tarutius: and it certainly alleges nothing which is not distinctly attributed to him. The time of the day is represented here in the same manner as by Solinus. The sun's place here too as well as in Solinus is in Taurus. The places of the planets are differently represented here from what they were in Solinus: and the moon is set forth as in Virgo; in Solinus as in Libra. Now calculation, as we shall see by-and-by, ascertains that on the day in question and at the time of the day in question, the former must actually have been the case; but not the latter. Unless therefore Tarutius made a mistake in his calculation of the moon's place on this occasion, he must have determined it to Virgo not to Libra. For this reason more particularly we incline to the conclusion that Lydus' account of his calculations is the most authentic and the most correct. Thus much however we may infer from the comparison of these several testimonies; viz. that Tarutius cast the Nativity, that is dated the

[c] De Mensibus, i. 14. p. 7.

Foundation, of the city on the Palilia; and the Palilia for the time being on some day when the sun was in Taurus. Now the sun's being in Taurus is an infallible criterion of the spring. It must be certain therefore that Tarutius dated the foundation in the spring.

Let us then in the last place produce the account of these same calculations, and of the results to which they led, which Plutarch also has given[d].

Ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατὰ Οὐάρρωνα τὸν φιλόσοφον χρόνοις ἄνδρα Ῥωμαίων ἐν ἱστορίᾳ βιβλιακώτατον ἦν Ταρούτιος ἑταῖρος αὐτοῦ, φιλόσοφος μὲν ἄλλως καὶ μαθηματικὸς, ἀπτόμενος δὲ καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν πίνακα μεθόδου θεωρίας ἕνεκα, καὶ δοκῶν ἐν αὐτῇ περιττὸς εἶναι. τούτῳ προὔβαλλεν ὁ Οὐάρρων ἀναγαγεῖν τὴν Ῥωμύλου γένεσιν εἰς ἡμέραν καὶ ὥραν, ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων ἀποτελεσμάτων περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ποιησάμενον τὸν συλλογισμὸν, ὥσπερ αἱ τῶν γεωμετρικῶν ὑφηγοῦνται προβλημάτων ἀναλύσεις. τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς θεωρίας εἶναι χρόνον τε λαβόντας ἀνθρώπου γενέσεως βίον προειπεῖν καὶ βίῳ δοθέντι θηρεῦσαι χρόνον.

Ἐποίησεν οὖν τὸ προσταχθὲν ὁ Ταρούτιος, καὶ τά τε πάθη καὶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπιδὼν, καὶ χρόνον ζωῆς καὶ τρόπον τελευτῆς καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα συνθεὶς εὖ μάλα τεθαρρηκότως καὶ ἀνδρείως ἀπεφήνατο τὴν μὲν ἐν τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου γεγονέναι σύλληψιν ἔτει πρώτῳ τῆς δευτέρας Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐν μηνὶ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους Χοιὰκ, τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τρίτης ὥρας, καθ' ἣν ὁ ἥλιος ἐξέλιπε παντελῶς· τὴν δ' ἐμφανῆ γένεσιν ἐν μηνὶ Θὼθ ἡμέρᾳ πρώτῃ μετ' εἰκάδα περὶ ἡλίου ἀνατολάς. κτισθῆναι δὲ τὴν Ῥώμην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνάτῃ Φαρμουθὶ μηνὸς ἱσταμένου μεταξὺ δευτέρας ὥρας καὶ τρίτης. ἐπεὶ καὶ πόλεως τύχην ὥσπερ ἀνθρώπου κύριον ἔχειν οἴονται χρόνον, ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀστέρων ἐποχὰς θεωρούμενον.

Now it admits of proof that this representation also of the calculations in question is consistent with itself, and with the representations of the same things which have been just produced before it; in all respects but one.

In the first place, the conception of Romulus is here dated Ol. ii. 1; and that would answer to B. C. 772, any time about midsummer. It is dated also on the 23rd of the Egyptian Chœac reckoned from midnight. Era Cyclica 3235, it will be seen from our Tables that the Nabonassarian Thoth reckoned from midnight was falling on March 4 at

[d] Romulus, xii.

midnight B. C. 772; and therefore the Nabonassarian Chœac 23, at midnight, on June 24 at midnight. It seems too that, agreeably to the common tradition and the common belief to that effect, (for which as we have seen[e] there was good foundation in the matter of fact,) Tarutius dated the conception in the midst of a solar eclipse; and that he calculated an eclipse of this kind for this assumed day of the conception, Chœac 23 Ol. ii. 1, at the third hour of the day: which was total. Now this Egyptian date as we have seen coincided with June 24 B. C. 772; and on June 24 B. C. 772 the Tables of Pingrè also shew an eclipse of the sun, at 10.15 A. M. for the meridian of Paris: the true time of which, if calculated afresh, would probably turn out to be somewhat earlier. This must have been Tarutius' eclipse; the eclipse of Chœac 23 at the third hour of the day, which for that season of the year would be about 8.15 A. M.: the eclipse at the conception of Romulus. So far then his calculations would seem to have been perfectly agreeable to the matter of fact, and to the testimony of modern astronomy itself; and even, if we consider the circumstances under which they were made, surprisingly accurate.

The conception then having thus been dated Chœac 23 Æra Cyc. 3235, June 24 B. C. 772; the birth, determined to Thoth 21 at sunrise, as the necessity of the case implies, must have been dated Thoth 21 at sunrise Æra Cyclica 3236; i. e. March 24 at sunrise (circa 6 A. M. mean time) B. C. 771: and that would be just 273 days complete after the supposed date of the conception, June 24 at the third hour, the year before; an assumption of the length of the interval, between the conception and the birth in a given instance, which would come within the bounds of possibility, and the limits prescribed by the laws of nature themselves[f].

It follows too from these assumptions that, if Tarutius dated the birth of Romulus on the 21st of Thoth (the Nabonassarian Thoth) Æra Cyclica 3236, he must have dated this birth at that time in the natural year when the sun according to the assumptions of the time was in Aries. It is observable that the Julian date of the 21st of the Nabonassarian Thoth, Æra Cyclica 3236, was March 24 B. C. 771; and March 24

[e] Vol. i. 326 sqq. [f] See Ibid.

in the sphere of Mazzaroth at this time was the stated date of the first of Krion [g]: i. e. of the entrance of the sun in that sphere into the first degree of Aries. The tropical sphere of the same epoch, combined with this sphere of Mazzaroth, was laid down *in octavis partibus;* and the mean vernal equinox, B. C. 771, in terms of the sphere of Mazzaroth would be assumed to bear date March 31. These distinctions were probably known to Tarutius at the time when he made his calculations. It must follow from them that, if he dated the birth of Romulus at last on March 24 B. C. 771, he dated it at that season of the natural year when the sun was on the point of leaving the sign of Pisces, and on the point of entering the sign of Aries; when in fact it must have been supposed to be in the 24th degree of Pisces: the 354th degree of the tropical sphere, but the first degree of Aries or Krion in the sphere of Mazzaroth. And this too as we have seen [h] was only agreeable to the oldest and best authenticated tradition on that point; and (as we may add) even to the matter of fact [h]. Tarutius at least could have known of no opinion which dated the birth of Romulus when the sun was in Libra; or of none which he considered to be entitled to any authority.

It is clear too from this date of the birth of Romulus, Thoth 21 of Nabonassar, Æra Cyclica 3236, March 24 B. C. 771, that if he adopted the traditionary account of the age of Romulus at the time of the foundation of the city, viz. 18 or 19 years [i], he must also have adopted the Varronian date of the Foundation, B. C. 753. For if Romulus was born Thoth 21 Æra Cyclica 3236, March 24 B. C. 771, he would be 18 complete on Thoth 21 Æra Cyclica 3254, March 19 B. C. 753; and actually in his 19th year at the date of the Foundation, the Palilia the same year, according to Varro. For the date of these Palilia on any assumption must have been later than March 19; and by Tarutius, as we shall see by and by, was supposed to be May 6, 48 days later. Nor is it probable *a priori* or even conceivable under the circumstances of the case that Tarutius' date of the Foundation could have been different from Varro's. The problem which he was undertaking to solve had been proposed to him by Varro; nor can

[g] See our Fasti Catholici, iii. 305. [h] Vol. i. 326 sqq. [i] Ibid. and p. 14.

there be any doubt that in submitting it to him for solution Varro expected to confirm his own date of the Foundation: and that in fact even the Varronian date of the Foundation rested at bottom on the results supplied by this calculation; or at least, even if otherwise obtained and otherwise confirmed, it was supposed to have been authenticated and placed out of doubt by this calculation[k].

Now, as the Nabonassarian Thoth Æra Cyclica 3254 fell on February 28 B. C. 753 (both reckoned from midnight), the first of Pharmuthi the same year must have fallen on September 25 at midnight; and consequently the ninth of Pharmuthi on October 3 at midnight. If then Plutarch was correct in what he proceeded to state next; viz. that Tarutius dated the Foundation on Pharmuthi 9, and in the Varronian year of the Foundation, B. C. 753, it must follow that he dated the Foundation on October 3 B. C. 753. And it must follow from that fact too that he dated the Palilia, in the year of the Foundation, on October 3; for we have had the express testimony of Cicero that he certainly dated the Foundation on the Palilia. It will follow from this fact too that he must have reckoned the Palilia to have been a feast of the autumn of the natural year; not of the spring. It is certain however that the Roman Palilia are no where in antiquity represented as a feast of the autumn; and not of the spring. Or whatsoever others might have thought on that point, it is clear that Tarutius could not have been of the same opinion. For he dated the Foundation on the Palilia, and yet when the sun was in Taurus. Consequently he dated the Palilia in the spring*.

* There is certainly a gloss extant in Servius, ad Georgica i. 34, which seems to connect the nativity of Rome with Scorpio: Ideo Augusto merito juxta Scorpionem locum adsignat, quia sidus hoc supra Romam positum creditur. But this does not necessarily prove that the city was founded when the sun was in Scorpio; only that for some reason or other the city was under the aspect, under the influence, or under the *tutela*, of Scorpio. And that might be accounted for because Scorpio was the house or domicile of Mars, the father of Romulus, and the patron of the city; and because the planet Mars itself, according to one of the accounts quoted supra, was actually in Scorpio at the time of the Foundation. There might be a difference of opinion respecting the time of the year at which Romulus was

[k] Cf. Vol. i. 33.

In this one circumstance then of Plutarch's account of the calculations and conclusions of Tarutius, viz. that he determined the nativity or foundation of the city to the ninth of Pharmuthi in the year in question, if there is no error in the reading of his text at present, there must be some misstatement of his own; some misapprehension of this *one* of the *actual* conclusions of Tarutius, which led him to represent it amiss. For that Tarutius could not possibly have dated the foundation on Pharmuthi 9, if that day coincided with October 3 B. C. 753, must be certain; and yet that there is no authority for suspecting the soundness of the present reading of the text of Plutarch, or for correcting it on critical grounds at least, is equally certain. It remains then to be considered whether this one of the statements of Plutarch can be explained and accounted for in any manner and on any principle, without giving up the integrity of his text on the one hand, or compromising any of the known opinions of the most learned and best informed of the Romans in general, or of Tarutius in particular, on the other.

ii. *On the explanation of* Tarutius' *date of the Foundation, or Nativity of the City, according to Plutarch, Pharmuthi* 9.

Preliminary then to this explanation we begin with reminding the reader that one of the criterions of the genuine results of the calculations of Tarutius, (and perhaps the most authentic, because the best attested of all,) is *this;* that the moon was in Virgo at the time of the Foundation. Another, and, for any thing which can be alleged to the contrary, an

born. Manilius as we have seen seems to have supposed it was at or about the autumnal equinox, when the sun was in Libra. John Lydus to judge from his fragments (De Mensibus, v. 115. l. 4. cf. 114. 10) must have dated it some time when the sun was in Scorpio. But there does not appear to have been any difference respecting the time of the year when the city was founded. Even Manilius' testimony supra, which seemed to date the foundation in Libra, does not expressly affirm that: only that Hesperia, *where* Rome was founded, was subject to Libra, was under the aspect of Libra, as being the seat of empire, the seat of the city which was the metropolis of the world; which held the scales of power and empire. Nor is the birth of Romulus in Libra necessarily affirmed in this passage; any more than the foundation of the city. Only that *he* too was born, as the city was founded, in Hesperia.

equally authentic one, is *this;* that the sun was in Taurus at the same time. Laying these two facts together, that the sun was in Taurus and the moon was in Virgo on the same day, the day of the Foundation, and at the same time of the day, we draw from both in conjunction *this* inference, which every one must admit to be legitimately deducible from such premises; viz. That on the actual day of the Foundation, and at the actual time of the day, whatsoever that was, according to Tarutius, the moon's elongation from the sun was *four signs,* at least, and for aught which appears to the contrary four signs complete: i. e. not less than 120 degrees. And 120 degrees by mean lunar motion being equivalent to nine days' complete and part of a tenth; it must follow from this fact too that on the day of the Foundation, according to Tarutius, the moon could not have been less than *nine days* old. Having this datum given, and that of the sun's being in Taurus, and also the year of the Foundation, the Varronian, B. C. 753; we have no difficulty in discovering from both the actual equable or Egyptian date to which Tarutius must have determined the day of the Foundation.

It will be seen from our General Lunar Tables that the principal new moon, Period xi. Cycle xii. 3, bore date March 28 at midnight B. C. 753; and the next to that April 26 at midnight. That this would be substantially correct might be collected from the solar eclipse the same year, Nov. 18 at 8.45 P. M. Paris. But in order to place it out of question we have thought it best to calculate the new moon of April for this year from our own Tables; and having done so we have found as follows.

		h.	m.	s.	
B. C. 753. mean new moon,	April 26	10	6	28	mean time Greenwich
	April 26	10	56	17	mean time Rome
True new moon,	April 26	18	24	36	mean time Greenwich
	April 26	19	14	25	mean time Rome.

It is manifest then that the 10th luna of this moon would be complete, and the 11th would begin to be current, May 6 at 19 h. 14 m. 25 s. from midnight for the meridian of Rome; or that, cyclically reckoned from April 27th at midnight, the 10th moon itself would begin to be current May 6 at mid-

night. Now if the first of the Nabonassarian Thoth the same year (Æra Cyclica 3254) fell on February 28 at midnight; the first of the Nabonassarian Athyr would fall on April 28 at midnight; and the ninth of the Nabonassarian Athyr on May 6 at midnight. It follows that the 9th of the Nabonassarian Athyr, Æra Cyclica 3254, coincided with the 10th luna of the moon of April, B. C. 753, reckoned from midnight, and *vice versâ*; as both did with May 6, reckoned from midnight the same year also. It follows too that, whether the ingress of the sun into Taurus, B. C. 753, was dated on the first of Tauron in the sphere of Mazzaroth, April 24, or on the first of Taurus in the tropical sphere, May 1, the sun in either case alike must have been reckoned to be in Taurus on May 6 at midnight. It is manifest also that the sun could not have been reckoned to be in Taurus any time that year, except between these limits of the first of Tauron in the sphere of Mazzaroth, April 24, and the first of Gemini in the tropical sphere, May 31 or June 1. It follows consequently that if the date of the Foundation was determined to some day in this year, when the sun was in Taurus and the moon was nine days old complete, it must have been determined to May 6 B. C. 753. No other day, B. C. 753, either before or after, could have combined these characters of the sun in Taurus and the lunar tenth but May 6. And if it was determined to the Julian May 6 B.C. 753; it must have been determined to the Nabonassarian Athyr. 9 Æra Cyclica 3254: for the Julian May 6 B. C. 753 and the Nabonassarian Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254 were absolutely one and the same.

In the next place it is observable that between Pharmuthi 9, the equable date of the Foundation according to Plutarch, and Athyr 9 (which only could have been the true equable date at the time), the interval in equable noctidiurnal time is five equable months or 150 days exactly; and five equable months or 150 days exactly would be the precise measure of the recession of a given equable (in the sense of a Nabonassarian) date on a given Julian one in 600 Julian years, or in five periods, each of 120 Julian years in length: that is, a given Julian date, like May 6, which B. C. 753 coincided with a given equable in the sense of a Nabonassarian date,

like Athyr 9; 600 years after exactly, B. C. 153, would coincide not with the Nabonassarian Athyr 9 but with the Nabonassarian Pharmuthi 9.

Now in this fact we possess all the explanation which is necessary to account for the error of statement which appears in Plutarch, respecting this *one* result of the calculations of Tarutius; the equable date to which he determined the foundation of Rome. It is clear from this account of Plutarch's that he must have reckoned by the Egyptian or equable, that is the Nabonassarian, year; and it is equally so from our other testimonies that he must have reckoned by the Roman year too: in other words, in this calculation of his he made use of both; he reckoned by neither independently of the other, but by both at once. And the method, in which he must have proceeded, to bring out the result at once in terms of each, it appears to us was this. He took the date of the Roman Palilia from the Roman calendar, at a certain time, at which it was falling *de facto* on May 6; and, assuming this date of the Palilia, May 6, as a fixed Julian date, he calculated first of all the Egyptian or equable date in the Æra of Nabonassar, i. e. the proper equable æra, which was coinciding with it at that point of time: and this having been determined accordingly, he reckoned 150 days back from it to get the corresponding equable date which coincided with the same Julian date at the time of the Foundation; and he found the former in Pharmuthi 9 of a given year of the Æra of Nabonassar, and the latter in Athyr 9, 600 equable years before: both however *mutatis mutandis* the same; and each of them in its proper order of time identical with the same Julian date, the date of the Palilia May 6—both the Palilia of the time from which he instituted the calculation, and the Palilia of the epoch of the Foundation.

We shall make ourselves better understood by entering into some further explanations. It is clear that Tarutius must have assumed, as the basis of his calculations, some year in the æra of the city which stood alike at the distance of 600 equable years and of 600 fixed or Julian years from the Varronian epoch of the Foundation. And this being the Kalends of January or the Palilia U. C. 1 B. C. 753; he would find that year in U. C. 601 of the Varronian reckoning also,

either ex Kalendis Januariis or ex Palilibus, B. C. 153, or Æra Cyclica 3854.

Now this period of 600 years, considered as an equable period of that particular magnitude, was a complete measure of the Egyptian Apis cycle; which being a cycle of 25 equable years entered into one of those periods of 600 years 24 times exactly. The same period considered as one of 600 Julian or 600 lunæsolar years, such as entered the regular cycle of the Roman calendar, was a complete measure also of the cycle of that calendar; whether that of Numa or that of the Decemvirs: for this cycle was a period of 24 years, and in one lunæsolar period of 600 years there would be 25 periods of 24 years exactly. It is clear then that Tarutius, having assumed this year, U. C. 601 of Varro B. C. 153, as the basis of his calculation, had nothing to do in the first place but to take the calendar date of the Palilia in that year of the actual cycle; which he would find to be May 6: and then to carry that date back 600 years, 25 cycles of the calendar exactly, to U. C. 1 B. C. 753; and he would get the Palilia of the Foundation, on the same day, May 6 also. And he had nothing to do in the next place but to take the equable date of May 6 U. C. 601 B. C. 153 in the Egyptian æra of Nabonassar of the time, which he would find to be Pharmuthi 9 Nab. 595 Æra Cyclica 3854; and then to go back 150 days or five equable months exactly, (i. e. in the contrary order of the equable reckoning); and he would get to the equable date of the Palilia of the epoch, Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254: which did as truly correspond to May 6 Julian B. C. 753 U. C. 1 of Varro, as Pharmuthi 9 to May 6 Julian B. C. 153 U. C. 601 of Varro.

That this is the true explanation of the process by which Tarutius must have obtained his date of the Foundation, both in terms of the Roman and in terms of the equable calendar, we think there can be no doubt. It is confirmed by too many critical coincidences to allow it to be called in question. For i. the 9th of the Nabonassarian Pharmuthi Nab. 595 or Æra Cyclica 3854 did actually coincide with May 6 B. C. 153 U. C. 601 of Varro; and the 9th of the Nabonassarian Athyr Æra Cyc. 3254 did actually coincide with May 6 B. C. 753 U. C. 1 of Varro: and as the interval from May 6 B. C. 753

or U. C. 1 to May 6 B. C. 153 or U. C. 601 was just equal to 600 Julian years; so the recession from Athyr 9 to Pharmuthi 9 in the equable calendar was just equal to five months, at the rate of one month in 120 years.

ii. May 6 B. C. 153 was the actual Julian date of the xi Kalendas Maias, or April 20 Roman, the calendar date of the Palilia U.C. 601; as our own calendar for that year shews: and, if the calendar as it was standing U. C. 601 B. C. 153 had been brought down regularly until that time from U. C. 1 B. C. 753, it is manifest that May 6 B. C. 753 must have been the proper Julian date of the xi Kal. Maias, April 20 Roman, (the calendar date of the Palilia,) U. C. 1, as much as the same day B. C. 153 U. C. 601. Nothing would require to be assumed in order to this coincidence except that the calendar had always been one and the same; had always been regular, and had always proceeded in cycles of 24 years, from the date of the first Palilia U. C. 1 to the date of the six hundred and first U. C. 601: and that was an assumption which, as we shall see by and by, in a case like this Tarutius would be at liberty to make.

iii. The particular misstatement of Plutarch, that Tarutius cast the Nativity of the city, that is determined the Foundation, at last to Pharmuthi 9, on this principle also, will be seen not to have been absolutely in the wrong; not to have been altogether without foundation. Tarutius must certainly have determined a certain Palilia to Pharmuthi 9; but not the Palilia of the Foundation: only that of the year from which he made his calculations. He determined the Palilia of this year, as a necessary preliminary to the determination of that of the Foundation; and he determined the former to Pharmuthi 9, the latter to Athyr 9: each as agreeably to the truth for the time being as the other. It is easy however to see that the latter of these equable dates itself was dependent on the former; and that no two things under such circumstances were more likely *a priori* to be confounded than the equable date of the Palilia of U. C. 601 and the equable date of the Palilia U. C. 1. Consequently that it would be nothing extraordinary if Plutarch was under the impression that Tarutius determined the equable date of the Palilia of the Foundation to Pharmuthi 9 instead of Athyr 9.

It is easy also to see that Pharmuthi 9 and Athyr 9, under these circumstances, were liable to be confounded not only with one another but with the birthday of Romulus; i. e. the Natalis Urbis or day of the Foundation, as attached to either of those dates, might be confounded with the Natalis of the Founder of the city. And this confusion seems to have been actually made; and very early too. It would not be easy on any other principle to account for Manilius' date of the birth of Romulus, in the sign of Libra; if such was actually his meaning in the testimony produced supra. But if it may be assumed that he dated this birth on the 9th of Pharmuthi, Æra Cyclica 3236, (the same year to which the calculation of Tarutius determined it,) when the first of the Nabonassarian Thoth fell on March 4 at midnight B. C. 771, it would admit of being explained; for Pharmuthi 9 at midnight would fall on October 8: and that would actually be a date in Libra. Again, an entry appears in the Constantian calendar (of which we have often made mention) opposite to iv Nonas Apriles April 2 of the time, to *this* effect; *N. Dei Quirin.:* the meaning of which we apprehend to be *Natalis Dei Quirini.* And as the *Deus Quirinus* can denote no divinity but Romulus, deified under that name; it follows that when this entry was consigned to that calendar the birth day of Romulus was supposed to be some day which coincided with iv Nonas Apriles. The date of this calendar was A. D. 355; but the entries found in it are no doubt many of them, (and this too among the rest,) much older than the calendar itself. Now the stated date of Pharmuthi 9 in the Alexandrine calendar, and in every year of the cycle of leap-year alike[1], was April 4; and this comes so near to April 2, (iv Nonas Apriles,) the Natalis Dei Quirini in this Constantian calendar, that we may very probably infer it is actually that date, only otherwise expressed. It may no doubt be demanded in that case why it does not appear in that calendar in the form of April 4, Pridie Nonas Apriles, instead of in that of April 2, iv Nonas Apriles? To this we answer that there were various times in the course of the actual administration of the Julian correction at Rome, between B. C. 45 and A. D. 225, when the iv Nonas Apriles

[1] Fasti Catholici, iv. 477.

in the Roman calendar and April 4 Julian would have been absolutely the same. One of these periods comes between A. D. 78 and A. D. 101. If this supposed birthday of Romulus, the Alexandrine Pharmuthi 9, was consigned to the calendar any time between those extremes, it could not have been in any form but this of iv Nonas Apriles, April 2, not April 4. Plutarch was writing his Lives between these extremes; and his testimony alone is competent to prove that the date of the Foundation at this time might be confounded with that of the Natalis of Romulus; and both with the Alexandrine Pharmuthi 9.

And yet besides this there is an entry discoverable in Lydus De Mensibus [m], which runs in the terms of Μνήμη Ῥέμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου, and must have belonged to some day in November; though his text in this part is so mutilated that we cannot pronounce for certain what day in November it was. It seems however to have been either the vii Idus, November 7, or the Nones, November 5; and we are of opinion that of these two it was the latter, not the former. Now the Nones of November, November 5, in the common years of the cycle, was the stated date of the Alexandrine Athyr 9 *. Here then we find the Μνήμη Ῥέμου καὶ Ῥωμύλου attached to Athyr 9—as in the preceding instance we found the Natalis Dei Quirini attached to Pharmuthi 9. These two things, the Memoria Romuli and the Natalis Dei Quirini, might be the same, or might be different; and it appears to us that they were most probably different. It is however too remarkable a coincidence to have been altogether the effect of chance, that both these

* If any one should be of opinion, (as possibly may be the case,) that the context of Lydus determines this Μνήμη to the vii Idus Novembres rather than to the Nones; yet even in that case it may still have been intended as the Roman date at a certain time of the Alexandrine Athyr 9. In the normal or original state of the Julian correction November 7 Roman corresponded to November 5 Julian; and there were many intervals, some of them for a considerable number of years in succession, after the date of the correction B. C. 45, and before A. D. 225, when that was the case: for example all through the reign of M. Aurelius, A. D. 161 to A. D. 180. At any time in this interval Athyr 9 consigned to the Roman calendar must have been so in the form of the vii Idus Novembres, November 7 Roman, not November 5.

[m] v. 115. l. 4; cf. 114. l. 10.

dates Pharmuthi 9 and Aythr 9, which made so conspicuous a figure in the original calculations of Tarutius, should be found connected in the course of time one with the Natalis Dei Quirini, the other with the Memoria Romuli, in the Roman calendar itself. It is no objection that these dates as they entered the calculations of Tarutius were equable or moveable dates; as they enter the Roman calendar in these instances respectively, were Alexandrine or fixed. They were nominally the same in both forms of the Egyptian calendar; and any other distinction between them was very liable to be overlooked.

Lastly, with regard to the lunar character of Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254 U. C. 1 Varr. B. C. 753; we can scarcely suppose that Tarutius would avail himself of the equable or Egyptian calendar, to determine the solar dates which entered into his calculations, and would not also make use of the proper lunar cycle of the equable or Egyptian solar year, (that is, the Apis cycle,) in order to ascertain and fix his lunar dates. On the principles of this cycle, the Lunar character of Athyr 9 Nab. 595 Æra Cyclica 3854 (the beginning of which year fell in U. C. 600 B. C. 154) would be considered identical with that of Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254, U. C. 1 B. C. 753. But so on the very same principles would that of Athyr 9 Nab. 695 Æra Cyclica 3954, U. C. 700 B. C. 54; for this too as well as the former stood at the distance of an even number of Apis cycles from Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254.

Now it is manifest that the lunar character of Athyr 9 Nab. 595 B. C. 154 was something which Tarutius could not possibly have known from his own observation; but that of Athyr 9 Nab. 695 B. C. 54 he must have been competent to judge of for himself. There is no doubt that both he and his friend Varro were capable of witnessing and judging of such things B. C. 54 from their own observation. We have not indeed been informed from any quarter of the exact time when Varro was settling his date of the Foundation[n]; nor when it was that he proposed his problem to Tarutius. But this we know; that B. C. 54–53 coincided with U. C. 700 of the Varronian reckoning of the Æra of the city: and that it

[n] See Vol. i. 30.

was a *secular* year in *his* Æra of that kind; the only one too which could possibly have fallen in *his* lifetime and in *that* of Tarutius: and it is easy to see that a *secular* year in his own reckoning of the Æra was the most convenient and suitable on which he could fix as the basis of calculation backwards, intended to bring him to the first year of the city in his own reckoning also. We know too that, if either he or Tarutius proposed to make use of the Apis cycle also in these calculations, they could not have pitched on a more convenient year than U. C. 700 B. C. 54–53 Nab. 695 Æra Cyclica 3954, which stood exactly at the distance of a certain number of such cycles from U. C. 1 B. C. 753 Æra Cyclica 3254. In short, to find any year equally suitable for their purpose, they must have either gone back one Apis cycle before, to Nab. 670 B. C. 79, or waited for one Apis cycle longer, until Nab. 720 B. C. 29. The former would be too early a date either for Varro's calculations of this kind, or for Tarutius': the latter would be too late an one. We know too, from the testimony of Cicero in particular, that in his own works, written and published before B. C. 54, he adopted the Polybian date of the Foundation[o]; in those which were of later date and are still extant he follows the Varronian: which in our opinion is a very strong argument that the Varronian epoch was actually settled and made known B. C. 54 or 53.

Now Nab. 695 the Nabonassarian Thoth bore date on September 6 at midnight B. C. 54; and therefore the Nabonassarian Athyr 9 on November 13 at midnight. There was a solar eclipse the same year Nov. 1 at 4.30 P. M. Paris; which might possibly be visible even at Rome. The fact of such an occurrence at least as an eclipse of the sun Nov. 1 B. C. 54 could scarcely be unknown to the astronomers of the time; or to those in particular who were in possession of the Chaldaïc Saros, as both Varro and Tarutius appear to have been. November 2 then reckoned from midnight being thus known, and from personal cognizance of the fact, to be the luna prima; November 13 reckoned from midnight would be infallibly known to be the luna duodecima: and if so Athyr 9 Nab. 695 which coincided with it at the time.

[o] See Vol. i. 35.

It is here however to be observed that perfect and faultless as the Apis cycle was for a very considerable time, as a constant measure of true lunar time in conjunction with equable solar time, and especially in the Æra of Nabonassar, of which Tarutius was making use; even that was liable to an error of excess at last in comparison of the truth: which, at this time, and in fact from the date of the Foundation downwards, as we shewed in our former work [p], amounted to one day in little more than 550 equable years. There is no reason why we should suppose that this liability of the Apis cycle to accumulate a day in excess on the moon in 550 years of its own æra, which was well known to the Egyptians, could have been unknown to one so well versed in the lore of the Egyptians as Tarutius. But if not, then he would at once collect from his knowledge of this fact that, if he went back 670 equable years from Nab. 695 Æra Cyclica 3954, i. e. to Æra Cyclica 3284; the lunar character of Athyr 8 or even Athyr 7 at the later of those epochs would be the true lunar character of Athyr 9 at the earlier. And Athyr 7. Nab. 695 Æra Cyc. 3954, reckoned from midnight, being the luna decima; Athyr 9, reckoned from midnight, Æra Cyclica 3254 would be the luna decima too. In this manner, and by fixing the date of his calculations to this day in the equable reckoning, Athyr 7 Nab. 695 B. C. 54, would Tarutius be enabled to obtain the true lunar character of Athyr 9 at the very epoch of the Foundation; and from his personal observation and personal knowledge of the true lunar character of Athyr 8 or Athyr 7 B. C. 54. And it is manifest that this mode of reasoning could not have led him to a false conclusion. It has been already shewn, from actual calculation, that the lunar character of Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254, cyclically reckoned from midnight, was the luna decima.

If we may assume that the time of the day to which Tarutius fixed the Foundation, (between the 2d and 3d hour Athyr 9 Æra Cyclica 3254 May 6 B. C. 753,) corresponded to about 8 A. M. mean time; then it appears from calculation that the sun's mean longitude at that epoch was 36° 18′ 40″, and the moon's mean longitude was 156° 43′ 40″: the latter

[p] Fasti Catholici, iv. 393.

consequently almost 120° exactly greater than the former. If the sun's place then at this epoch was reckoned to be the 7° of Taurus, the moon's must have been reckoned to be the 7° of Virgo. The true longitude indeed both of the sun and of the moon, at this point of time, would be something greater than the mean; especially that of the moon. But the above is a striking coincidence; and serves fully to justify the opinion which we expressed supra[q]: viz. that, of the two epochs assigned to the moon, both apparently on the authority of Tarutius, one in Libra the other in Virgo, the latter alone could have been that which he really assigned it. The exactness, with which he determined the solar eclipse of June 24 B.C. 772, must be a sufficient proof that he was competent to discover and fix with just the same or proportional accuracy the true lunar character of May 6 B.C. 771. It must be utterly incredible at least that he could have been mistaken in the determination of that problem to the extent of an entire sign. If not, he must have fixed the moon's place at the time in question to some degree in Virgo; and the sun's to some corresponding degree in Taurus. Among the testimonies produced supra John Lydus's was the only one which stated both these conclusions of his accordingly: from which we think we are bound to infer that Lydus' account of the rest of his calculations for the same point of time in all probability was the most correct.

iii. *Inferences deducible from the above conclusions.*

The preceding explanations have an obvious tendency to satisfy us on some interesting and curious points, about which we must otherwise have continued more or less in suspense.

i. It may evidently be collected from them that the true length of the regular cycle of the ancient calendar must still have been well known to the learned Romans in the time of Varro and Tarutius: and this may contribute to render it less surprising that it should have come to the knowledge of Macrobius, and that he in particular should have given so exact an account of it[r].

[q] Page 171.

[r] Diss. iii. ch. iii. sect. i. Vol. i. 266.

ii. That the best informed among the Romans on the subject of the ancient calendar could not have supposed that there was any material difference between the regular cycle of the calendar of Numa from the first, and that of the Decemviral correction after it; as neither indeed was there any but what was purely accidental.

iii. That, though the use of the regular cycle had been laid aside so long before as B. C. 208, yet it was still known what it was originally, and what it ought to have been all along; and how it would have proceeded continually, had it been retained perpetually in use.

iv. That it was possible, at any point of time during this period of the irregular administration of the calendar, to ascertain its state and administration at any preceding epoch of the same period; for Tarutius' calculations as we have seen every reason to conclude were instituted B. C. 54—53, and yet were founded ultimately on an accurate knowledge of the actual state of the calendar an hundred years before, B. C. 154—153. With respect indeed to the assumption on which also he appears to have proceeded, (viz. that one and the same form of the civil calendar had been in use at Rome, from the Foundation downwards, as long as the calendar was regular, and one which did not differ from the Decemviral correction,) it was not, it is true, compatible with a perfect knowledge of the previous history of the civil calendar of Rome; and that the calendar of Numa had been in use there before the Decemviral correction, and the Nundinal calendar of Romulus before the calendar of Numa. But on this point there was room *a priori* for a difference of opinion even among the most learned of the Romans themselves; and on this point, as we have seen[s], differences of opinion did actually exist among them. There were many who thought that a calendar like that of Numa or like that of the Decemvirs, (which were substantially one and the same,) had been in actual use at Rome from the very day of the Foundation itself; and Tarutius was at liberty to espouse that opinion too if he thought proper. In any case, the actual date of the Palilia U. C. 601 B. C. 153 being May 6, it was manifestly

[s] Diss. ii. ch. i. sect. iii. Vol. i. 64: sect. vii. Ib. 79: Diss. iii. ch. i. sect. ii. Ib. 177.

allowable to regard and to treat that as a fixed date of its kind; and to carry it back accordingly even to the epoch of the Foundation. As to the further objection that U. C. 601 the Kalends of January were falling on December 28 B. C. 154, not on December 29, the proper epoch of the Decemviral correction; it would make no difference to the actual date of the Palilia, the xi Kal. Maias, the same year. In the actual administration of U. C. 601, the year was intercalary, and the Merkedonius was one of 23 days. In the first year of the regular Decemviral cycle the Merkedonius was one of 22 days. Though therefore the Kalends of January U. C. 601 were one day behind, the Kalends of January in the first year of the regular Decemviral cycle; the xi Kalendas Maias, April 20 Roman, was *de facto* the same day in the former as by rule it was bound to be in the latter.

And lastly it clearly appears from this coincidence too, as well as from all the preceding explanations, that the proper meaning of the stated calendar date of the Palilia, xi Kalendas Maias, as assumed and recognized in these calculations of Tarutius throughout, was April 20 Roman not April 21. And this would be a decisive proof that his calculations were made and concluded before the Julian correction at least; from which time forward the same nominal calendar date of xi Kal. Maias did as truly denote April 21 Roman as April 20 before.

Equable Egyptian Calendar Nab. 595 B. C. 154–153.				Irregular Roman Calendar Cycle iii. 8. U. C. 601.		
Months.	Midn.		B. C.			
i Thoth	1 Oct.	1	154			
ii Phaophi	1 ..	31	..			
iii Athyr	1 Nov.	30	..	Kalendæ.	Midn.	B. C.
iv Chœac	1 Dec.	30	154	i Januariæ	Dec. 28	154
v Tybi	1 Jan.	29	153	ii Februariæ	Jan. 26	153
vi Mecheir	1 Feb.	28	..	iii Interkalares	Feb. 18	..
vii Phamenoth	1 Mar.	29	..	iv Martiæ	Mar. 17	..
viii Pharmuthi	1 April	28	..	v Apriles	April 17	..
Pharmuthi	9 May	6		xi Kal. Maias,	May 6.	

SECTION II.—*On the change of the Consular Ingress U. C. 601 B. C. 153.*

This year U. C. 601 B. C. 153, as we have already had occasion to shew[t], is remarkable for another coincidence; viz. that of the change of the consular ingress from the Ides of March to the Kalends of January: which was, in fact, a return to the first and oldest official rule. It would appear too from the testimony of Cicero in particular[u] that either B. C. 154 or 153 a new Pontifex Maximus, P. Scipio Nasica, must have come into office. And though it would not be reasonable, nor consistent with the previous course of things, to deny to his predecessor M. Æmilius Lepidus just deceased the credit of having restored the calendar, before his death, to its original relations (especially to the natural year); yet we shall see a much greater degree of regularity to have been observed in its administration from this time forward, and under the new Pontifex Maximus, than can be discovered in it at any previous point of time since it became irregular. Whether the return of the Kalends of January to their old and proper epoch, December 28, had any thing to do with the change in the rule of the ingress which took place at the same time, we cannot undertake to say; but it might evidently have much to do with the future administration of the calendar: and might be an additional reason for rendering it thenceforwards as regular as under the circumstances of the case was possible.

On the chronology of the first year of the Bellum Celtibericum.

There are further proofs of the truth of our Roman Fasti for this year U. C. 601 B. C. 154–153; to which we think it proper to direct attention also. It is well known that a revolt took place in Spain this year, among some of the communities there before subject to the Romans; followed by a long and critical war of thirteen or fourteen years' duration[w]. The contemporary historians ascribe even the change in the rule of the ingress to this coincidence; though without also

[t] Diss. ix. ch. ii. sect. viii. Vol. ii. 243. [u] Diss. xiii. ch. i. sect. iv. Vol. iii. 30.
[w] Vol. i. 244.

taking into account the state of the calendar at the time it is not easy to see how that alone could have been competent to produce it*.

The first of the Roman commanders in this war was one of the consuls of the year, Nobilior, whom Appian calls Nobelio[x]. The beginning of the contest was unfavourable to the Romans. Their army was defeated by the Spaniards under a chieftain, elected three days before, whom Appian styles Carus. The day of this defeat was the Vulcanalia[y]: *Ἐγίγνετο δὲ ταῦθ' ὅτε Ῥωμαῖοι τῷ Ἡφαίστῳ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν. ὅθεν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐκὼν ἄρξειεν ἐξ ἐκείνου μάχης παρὰ τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν*. In the fragments of the Julian calendar the stated date of the Vulcanalia is x Kalendas Septembres[z], August 23; which in the Decemviral calendar corresponded to Sextilis 21, and this year fell on September 4. The Romans indeed partially retrieved their ill success the same day; the enemy in the ardour of the pursuit having got into confusion, and while in that state having been attacked by the Roman cavalry which had been left to defend the camp. And this it appears was at the end of the day; for the night came on soon after, and put a stop to the contest on both sides.

Yet we are told[a] that this same night the Aruaci or Arevaci with all their military population retreated to Numantia; and that would imply that they had moonlight in the course of it for the execution of that step. It turns out that such would actually be the case. There was an eclipse of the moon this year, Sept. 2, only two days before the battle.

* From the Epitome of Livy, xlvii, it may be inferred that the comitia of the year could not yet have been held when the news of the rising in Spain arrived at Rome; yet that they were so held, (and in consequence of the news, as it implies,) that the new consuls entered on office upon the Kalends of January Dec. 28 B. C. 154. While the ingress was still the Ides of March, the regular time of the comitia might be as late as January or February Roman; but most commonly it would be November or December. In this instance it does not appear that the comitia were anticipated; only the ingress. The consuls elected were appointed with the understanding that they should enter on office almost immediately, Ex Kal. Januariis, not Ex Idibus Martiis.

[x] vi. 45. Cf. Livy, xlix.
[y] Cf. Diss. v. ch. iii. sect. iv. Vol. i. 484.
[z] Maffæan, Capranic, Pincian, apud Foggini. Cf. Varro, De Lingua Lat. v. 57. Gruter, lxi. 3.
[a] Appian, vi. 46.

Consequently on the night of the battle September 4 there must have been almost the light of the full moon. Yet even that moon would not rise, September 4, until an hour or two after sunset: so that the pursuit of the Romans might be stopped by the dark not long after sunset, as it is said to have been; and yet there would be light for any other purpose, like that of the removal of the Arevaci to Numantia, for much the greater part of the night. It may be inferred from an observation of Strabo's[b] that the tribes in this part of Spain paid particular attention to the nights on which the moon was at the full: *Ἔνιοι δὲ τοὺς Καλλαϊκοὺς ἀθέους φασί· τοὺς δὲ Κελτίβηρας καὶ τοὺς προσβόρρους τῶν ὁμόρων αὐτοῖς ἀνωνύμῳ τινὶ θεῷ ταῖς πανσελήνοις νύκτωρ πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν πανοικί τε χορεύειν καὶ παννυχίζειν.* On this principle, they would always be ready on the nights of the full moons to remove with all their families and effects, if there was occasion, from one place to another.

Three days after these proceedings, consequently Sextilis 24, September 7, Nobilior laid siege to Numantia[c]; and soon after, while before that city, experienced a second reverse of fortune almost as serious as the former: and this was followed by more; so that at last even Ocelis, (Ptolemy, Geogr. ii. v. § 9. Ὄκελον,) a neighbouring city, where the Roman headquarters had been fixed, and from which they drew their supplies, was induced to join in the general defection: in consequence of which Nobilior was compelled Sub pellibus hiemare: *Ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ διεχείμαζε, στεγάσας ὡς ἐδύνατο... καὶ κακοπαθῶν...καὶ νιφετοῦ πυκνότητι καὶ κρύους χαλεπότητι· ὥστε πολλοὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν οἱ μὲν ἐν τοῖς φρυγανισμοῖς οἱ δὲ καὶ ἔνδον ὑπὸ στενοχωρίας καὶ κρύους ἀπώλλυντο*[d]. These are plain intimations of the setting in of winter soon after the revolt of Ocelis; and that could not have been later than the middle or end of the Roman September; which must consequently have fallen at this period very much like the Julian September: as our calendar shews that it did.

[b] iii. 4. Whether the calendar of these communities at this time also was lunar may or may not be inferrible from these statements concerning them. The Gauls however paid the same kind of regard to the full moon; and their calendar at this time was certainly lunar. In any case, it is a just inference from such statements, in our opinion, that the Noctidiurnal cycle of these Spanish tribes, agreeably to the universal rule at first, was still reckoned from evening.

[c] Appian, vi. 46. [d] Ibid. 47.

SECTION III.—*On the date of the Treatise of Cato* De Re Rustica.

From the state of the calendar too during the first eight years of this third cycle, we may probably also collect the true date of the extant treatise of Cato the elder, De Re Rustica. There are various allusions in that work from which a correct idea of the relation of the civil to the natural year at the time when they were penned may be derived; and that in our opinion is such as to apply to the seventh year of this particular cycle, when the Kalends of January were bearing date January 8 B. C. 154, more exactly than to any other, before or after it, which could have come within the lifetime of Cato himself.

As first, where he is speaking De olea pendente[e], i. e. of the olive-crop as yet ungathered, as still on the trees; it appears that at the time when he was writing it might be considered to be ripe, and in a fit state to be gathered, and consequently to be disposed of by sale or contract, Ex Kalendis Novembribus. If so, the civil year at the same point of time could not have been much out of proportion to the natural; for even in the Julian year, and even in Italy, the month of November, (as we may have occasion to shew more at large on a future opportunity,) was the usual month of the olive-gathering: and U. C. 600 B. C. 154, as our calendar shews, the Kalends of November were falling on October 31; i. e. as nearly as possible on their proper date in the Julian year itself. In reference too to this part of the produce of the year, and to its proper application when gathered, we find the following direction[f]: Si gelicidia erunt cum oleam coges, triduum aut quatriduum post oleum facito: i. e. if the olives still hanging on the tree had been previously a little touched and mellowed by a frost they would be ready for the press so much the sooner. A frost by October 31, even for the climate of Rome or Campania, would be nothing incredible nor extraordinary.

Again, it is observable that the term of credit which the seller of the crop in this case is recommended to allow to the buyer of it is ten months, Ex Kalendis Novembribus in

[e] Cap. cxlvi. [f] Ibid. lxv.

question[g]. This term of ten months, in such a case, in itself is nothing extraordinary. It was the usual length of the year of credit among the Romans[h]. If there is any thing peculiar in it, it lies in the limits prescribed for the year in question; ten months, from the Kalends of November in one year to the Kalends of September in another: and, if the year was really U. C. 600 B. C. 154, that would be from October 31 B. C. 154 to September 13 B. C. 153. Now the ultimate origin of this particular rule among the Romans relating to the year of credit, as we shewed on a former occasion, is to be traced up to the use of the Nundinal year among them; and though the Nundinal year as the civil year had long been laid aside at Rome, yet, from the time of Servius Tullius and that of the institution of the census, it had been connected even among the Romans with the Lustral cycle: and that cycle in particular appears to have been all along regulated by it. B. C. 154 was a Lustral year. It was the date of the lxxxist cycle[i]: in which the Nundinal Martius fell on Jan. 4 Roman U. C. 600, January 11 Julian B. C. 154. The second year of this cycle would bear date Nov. 11 B. C. 154; and the third Sept. 10 B. C. 153. The Kalends of November Oct. 31 and the Kalends of September Sept. 13 were the nearest dates to these which could have been specified, in terms of the Roman calendar, U. C. 600 to U. C. 601. If they were purposely specified on that account; it would be demonstrative proof that these limits were prescribed U. C. 601 B. C. 154.

Again, where he is speaking De vino pendente[k], the vine-crop of the year, ready to be gathered, but not yet so gathered; the direction given is Locus vini ad Kalendas Octobris primas dabitur. si non ante ea exportaveris dominus vino quid volet faciet[l]. And this must imply that it must have been supposed that the grapes would be ripe and ready for the vintage on the Kalends of October. Scaliger[m] inferred from this direction that the Roman October had now got into the place of the Julian September. But that would suppose that the natural and regular vintage month for the

[g] Cap. cxlvi.
[h] Diss. ii. ch. i. sect. iv. Vol. i. 72.
[i] Vol. ii. 330.
[k] Cap. cxlvii. Cf. cxlviii.
[l] Cf. cxliii.
[m] De Emendatione, ii. 186. A.

climate of Italy about Rome was the Julian September, and, for the time of Cato, a month before the autumnal equinox. The grapes indeed in some parts of Italy might be ripe at the beginning of September; but, as a general rule, and throughout the country, even for that part of it where Cato must be supposed to have been writing (Campania more particularly), that would not be the case before the autumnal equinox: that is, in his time towards the end of the Julian September; as we hope to shew more at large on a future occasion. The inference which we ourselves draw from this direction is that, when Cato was penning it, October Roman did not differ materially from October Julian. Our calendar shews that U. C. 600 B. C. 154 such was the case. The Kalends of October were then falling on September 30.

There is another direction, relating to the *vinum in doliis*[n]; the wine already made and bottled or jarred; Vinum accipito (sc. emtor) ante K. Jan. primas: i. e. the buyer was to fetch it from the premises by the first of January after the Kalends of October; by which, in the natural course of things, the grapes would have been gathered and pressed. This was to allow three months for the fermenting and settling of the wine in the jars. It should be observed however, as we had occasion to explain in a former part of this work[o], that the time of the year which was supposed to try the new wine most was that of the Flatus Favonii, the setting in of the first warm winds after the winter; and in the Julian calendar that was the beginning of February. It would seem to be only reasonable that the risk of this critical season should be run by the purchaser, not by the seller; and therefore that the wine of the last year's vintage, having been already tasted and approved and bargained for by the Kalends of October or soon after, should be carried home by the purchaser on or before the Kalends of January.

Again, De Pabulo hiberno[p], and the location, letting, or farming of it; the direction is Pabulum frui occipito ex Kal. Septembribus....cetero pabulo Kalendis Martiis cedito. This allows six months in all for the use of the Pabulum hibernum of every kind, the right of pasture on the winter fare of cattle; and had the Julian year been in existence at Rome in

[n] Cap. cxlviii. [o] Diss. iii. ch. iii. sect. vi. Vol. i. 296. [p] Cap. cxlix.

Cato's time nothing would have been more natural than to infer from such a direction that this right was to begin about a month before the autumnal equinox and to terminate about a month before the vernal. The case was very little different U.C. 600 B.C. 154; when the Kalends of March fell on March 5, and the Kalends of September on September 1: and the mean vernal equinox was falling on March 26, the true on March 24; the mean autumnal equinox on September 25, the true on September 26, for the meridian of Rome.

And here we may point out another coincidence; Olivetum diebus xv ante æquinoctium vernum incipito putare. ex eo die dies xlv recte putabis [q]. It is exceedingly probable that these 45 days were intended of the interval in the Roman calendar from the Ides of some month, in which they fell on the 15th, to the end of the next month, which of course would be a month of 29 days. Now that would be the case with the interval from the Ides of March to the end of the month of Aprilis; just 45 days from the former exclusive to the latter inclusive. If this conjecture is in the right, then when this direction was given the Ides of March were falling 15 days before the vernal equinox, or the assumed date of the vernal equinox. U.C. 600 B.C. 154 the Kalends of March were falling on March 5, and therefore the Ides on March 19; and the vernal equinox, 15 days after March 19, on this principle would be dated April 3. That would be too late for the mean vernal equinox of this time, March 26; or for the true March 24: but it would be exactly coincident with the fixed date of the vernal equinox in the Etrurian sphere, after B.C. 672, April 3 [r]; and there might be many reasons why, in this treatise of his De Re Rustica, Cato might choose to take his natural terms, cardinal points, or *στηρίγματα*, from that sphere in particular: between which, as it was, and the true even at this time the difference for all practical purposes might be considered almost imperceptible.

Again, De fructu ovium vendendo [s], the direction given is this: Agnus diem et noctem qui vixerit in fructum cedat (sc. emtori): et Kalendis Juniis emtor fructu decedat. It is hereby implied that by the last day of Maius the lambing

[q] Cap. xliv. Cf. Pliny, H. N. xvii. 30. § 1. 623. [r] Diss. xi. ch. v. sect. viii. Vol. ii. 508. [s] Cap. cl.

season for the year might fairly be supposed to be over; and therefore that any lambs dropped later than that day, i. e. on or after the Kalends of June, could not be considered as comprehended in the ordinary terms and construction of a bargain previously made for the *fructus ovium* of the year. And, if Maius was the last of the spring months and Junius was the first of the summer months at this time, that would be only consistent and natural. The spring months of the regular calendar indeed were Martius and Aprilis, as we have seen[t]. Here Cato specifies the Kalends of June as the natural termination of the spring; and if he reckoned the vernal equinox, (agreeably to the Etrurian division of the sphere,) from April 3, he probably reckoned the summer solstice, agreeably to the same division also for this time, on July 4. And this brings a remarkable coincidence to light; viz. that the Kalends of June, U.C. 600 B.C. 154, fell critically on June 4; i. e. just one month before this date of the solstice. The true date of the summer solstice at this time was June 25 and 26; that of the mean was June 24 and 25.

Cato adds, Si interkalatum erit K. Maiis (emtor sc. fructu) decedat; from which it follows that the preceding direction was intended for a common year of the calendar, and that this qualification was necessary to adapt it to an intercalary one. U. C. 600 B. C. 154 was a common year. U. C. 601 B.C. 153 was an intercalary one. It is observable that the terms of this qualification run Si interkalatum erit; not Quando or Cum interkalatum fuerit: which in our opinion implies that intercalary years at this period of the history of the calendar were not matters of course, and could not be looked for at stated times. It is a very clear inference from this manner of speaking that the year in which Cato himself was writing had not been, or was not expected to be, intercalary. Now there is no common year, among the first seven years of this third cycle, but B. C. 154—153, and B. C. 160—159. In the latter of these years every month in the calendar was a month at least in anticipation of the Julian month of the same name. None of the preceding allusions therefore could have applied to *this* year with any thing like the same propriety with which they do so to B. C. 154.

[t] Diss. xiii. ch. v. sect. ii. Supra, p. 89.

As to the qualification itself, or the modification of the terms of a contract like this for the *Fructus ovium*, the produce of the spring months of the year, (limited as above defined by April 3 and by June 4,) according as it was intended for a common year, or for an intercalary year of the calendar respectively; in an intercalary year the Kalends of May would be advanced 22 or 23 days more into the summer. Thus had U.C. 600 been intercalated, as the next year was, with a Merkedonius of 23 days, the Kalends of January still bearing date on the 8th of January; the Kalends of May would have fallen on the 27th of May: only eight days earlier than June 4. In this case it would evidently have been just as reasonable to prescribe the Kalends of May for the limit of the Fructus ovium, as the Kalends of June under the actual circumstances of the case *.

For these reasons then, and from these considerations, we think it may be concluded with very great probability that this treatise of Cato's De Re Rustica was actually written U. C. 600 B. C. 154. We are not aware of any objection which could be urged against that conclusion from any known fact of his personal history. The date of this work of his has not been handed down in terms; yet there is good reason to believe that it was written late in his lifetime, and did not long precede his death. Plutarch has mentioned it in his life of Cato; but he has not specified its date. There is however an allusion to it in the Natural History of Pliny, which comes very near to an actual statement of its actual date; and that too precisely the same to which we have ourselves determined it, U. C. 600: Separatim toto tractatu sententia ejus (Catonis sc.) indicanda est, ut in omni genere noscamus quæ fuerint celeberrima anno sexcentesimo urbis, circa captas Carthaginem ac Corinthum quum supremum is

* We have not discovered any allusions to the moon in this treatise, which are calculated to throw light on its date. It is observable that U. C. 600 the Kalends of January, January 8 at midnight B. C. 154, would be true to the moon *Ex phasi*: i. e. at two or three days old. Hence even such a direction as the following, understood of that year, would be significant; Nisi intermestri lunaque dimidiata materiam ne tangas: Cap. xxxvii. § 3. The first lunar dichotomy U. C. 600 would fall on the vii Idus of January themselves.

diem obiit; et quantum postea ccxxx annis vita profecerit [u]. The reading of both these numbers is genuine. The latter, intended of the interval from the date of Cato's work De Re Rustica to that of the Natural History, confirms the former; for the date of the Natural History was actually U. C. 830, exactly 230 years from U. C. 600. The passage indeed is ambiguous; since it appears to date the death of Cato and the capture of Corinth and Carthage as both alike events of U. C. 600. But Pliny very well knew that Cato died in reality in U. C. 605; three years before the destruction of those two cities. There is no reason then why we should not suppose him to have intended to refer the death of Cato to the time generally denoted by *circa captas Carthaginem ac Corinthum*, which would be true of it generally also; but the date of his work De Re Rustica, which contained his observations and rules and directions of that kind, to the *anno sexcentesimo urbis*. The form of that date implies that it was strictly intended: *in* the six hundredth year, not *about* the six hundredth year. If so Pliny must have known that these observations and rules of Cato were actually made public in the 600th year of the city; were actually the most approved and most popular which had appeared up to that time; or which had yet been known of in the six hundredth year of the city *.

* Pliny observes [1] that there was no medicus by profession at Rome up to U. C. 600; nor does any allusion to medici occur in this treatise of Cato's: though he is said to have mentioned some such who were his contemporaries, in others of his works [2]. In fact, according to Plutarch, he disliked the profession generally: Ὁ δ' οὐ μόνον ἀπηχθάνετο τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσιν Ἑλλήνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἰατρεύοντας ἐν Ῥώμῃ δι' ὑποψίας εἶχεν [3]. The above statement of Pliny's then is quite consistent with our assumed date of the Res Rustica, U. C. 600. That it was written for contemporaries, and was expected to pass into the hands of contemporaries, is evident from itself. Hence its mention of *living* names; L. Turinius of Casinum, C. Mennius of Venafrum, Manius Percennius of Nola [4], &c. It alludes also by name to the Numi Victoriati [5]; and these, according to Pliny [6], were first introduced into Rome by the Triumphus Illyricus of Anicius [7], B. C. 167.

1 H. N. xxix. 5. 347: cf. 8. 361: xxix. 6.
2 Cf. H. N. xxx. 7.
3 Vita, xxiii: cf. Pliny, H. N. xxix. 7.
4 Cap. cxxxv. p. 97. § 3: cli. § 2.
5 cxlv. § 3.
6 H. N. xxxiii. 13. p. 64: cf. Festus, xiv. 327. 13 Patres.
7 Supra, p. 166.

u xiv. 5. p. 39: cf. xiv. 13: xix. 42. p. 429.

SECTION IV.—*On the administration of the Calendar from B. C. 154 downwards.*

With regard to the remainder of this third cycle, from B. C. 154–153 down to B. C. 137; there is no date extant

Plutarch mentions this treatise of Cato's among his other works; and observes upon it that he had descended in it even into such minutiæ as a recipe for making pancakes (πλακοῦντας) and the like: but he does not assign its date; nor say at what period of his life it was written: *Συνετάττετο μὲν οὖν λόγους τε παντοδαποὺς καὶ ἱστορίας. γεωργίᾳ δὲ προσεῖχε νέος μὲν ὢν ἔτι καὶ διὰ τὴν χρείαν· φησὶ γὰρ δυσὶ κεχρῆσθαι μόνοις πορισμοῖς, γεωργίᾳ καὶ φειδοῖ. τότε δὲ διαγωγὴν καὶ θεωρίαν αὐτῷ τὰ γιγνόμενα κατ' ἀγρὸν παρεῖχε. καὶ συντέτακταί γε βιβλίον γεωργικὸν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ πλακούντων σκευασίας*[7] *καὶ τηρήσεως ὁπώρας γέγραφεν, ἐν παντὶ φιλοτιμούμενος περιττὸς εἶναι καὶ ἴδιος*[8]. We may collect however from A. Gellius that it could not have been written before the 70th year of his age; M. Cato, consularis et censorius, publicis jam privatisque opulentus rebus, villas suas inexcultas et rudes, ne tectorio quidem prælitas, fuisse dicit ad annum usque ætatis suæ septuagesimum[9]. Plutarch probably alludes to this saying of his, in what he too mentions: *Τῶν δ' ἐπαύλεων αὐτοῦ μηδεμίαν εἶναι κεκονιαμένην*[10]: and he was then an old man.

With regard to the chronology of his life in general; according to Cicero[11] he was born (at Tusculum[12]) U. C. 520 B. C. 234; and died U. C. 605 B. C. 149. The supposed date of this dialogue[13] was the 33rd year after the death of Scipio Africanus the elder; and that is dated nine years after the consulship of Cato U. C. 559 B. C. 195, and one year before his censorship U. C. 570 B. C. 184[14]. These statements are not strictly exact. The true date of Scipio's death as we have seen[15] from the testimony of Polybius was U. C. 572 B. C. 182. But they do not affect the present question[16].

The above date of his birth, U. C. 520 B. C. 234, is consistent with what Plutarch[17] records from himself, that he was 17 when he served his first campaign; and that that was *Περὶ ὃν Ἀννίβας χρόνον εὐτυχῶν ἐπέφλεγε τὴν Ἰταλίαν*. If this means 17 complete that would be the case U. C. 537 B. C. 217 in the year of Thrasimen[18]. And in this case we may infer

7 Cf. De Re Rustica, lxxvi.
8 Vita, xxv. 9 xiii. 23.
10 Vita, iv.
11 De Senectute, 4, 10: 5, 14: 6, 19: 10, 32: 14, 50.
12 Plutarch, Vita, i. Cornelius Nepos, Vita, i. Silius Ital. vii. 691.
13 Cap. 6, 19. 14 Ibid.
15 Diss. xiv. ch. i. sect. iii. Supra, 122.
16 Cf. De Amicitia, 3, 11: Tusculanæ, 1, 2, 3: Brutus, 15, 60: 61: 20, 80: 23, 89.
17 Vita, i.
18 Cf. Cornelius Nepos, Vita, i. who dates his first campaign Q. Fabio Maximo M. Claudio Marcello Coss. i. e. U. C. 540; at 17 years of age. In Silius Italicus Cato appears first in his viith book, (vii. 691) and that belongs to the year of Thrasimen.

which comes within it, not even the date of a triumph, of which we are ourselves aware; and yet the administration of

that Cato was born some day before the date of Thrasimen at least, June 22 Roman, July 12 Julian.

In like manner it seems to be agreed that he died in the first year of the third Punic war: Ἀρξαμένων δὲ πολεμεῖν ἐτελεύτησε[19]. This war began U. C. 605 B. C. 149 in the consular year of L. Marcius Censorinus Man. Manilius. In this year Pliny distinctly dates his death: Atque hic Cato DCV anno urbis nostræ obiit, LXXXV° suo[20]. And yet Cicero[21] would imply that he died before the war broke out. But so far from this; there is good reason to believe that he must have lived until near the end of the first year of the war itself, and of the consular year in which it began: Æmilianum quoque Scipionem, says Pliny[22], Varro auctor est donatum obsidionali in Africa Manilio consule cohortibus servatis. Cato lived to hear of *that* event of the first year at least[23].

The age of Cato at his death, U. C. 605, consequently is correctly represented by Pliny and Cicero in the above passages at 85, understood at least of 85 complete; though in strictness he must have died in his 86th year, if he was born U. C. 520 on some day before June 22 Roman that year. Yet Livy supposes him to have lived to be 90: Qui sextum et octogesimum annum agens caussam dixerit, ipse pro se oraverit scripseritque: nonagesimo anno Ser. Galbam ad populi adduxerit judicium[24]. These statements are both repeated by Plutarch[25]; and the first of them is so by Valerius Maximus[26]. The latter must be in error. It would be confuted by Cato's account of his own age at the battle of Thrasimen, 17 or 18. For this accusation of Ser. Galba was certainly not later than U. C. 605 B. C. 149: and had Cato been 90 then he must have been born U. C. 516, and would have been 21 at least in the year of Thrasimen U. C. 537. But Cato was often accused or accuser in the course of his life. Plutarch says he was *reus* or defendant in 50 δίκαι[27]: and Cicero[28] that he left 150 orations behind him, many of them delivered in his own defence. Plutarch from another of his allusions[29] gives us reason to conclude that his true age on the occasion when Livy, Valerius Maximus, and even he himself in his Vita, suppose him to have been 86, was in reality only 80.

It seems to be agreed too that his accusation of Ser. Galba was one of the events of the very last year of his life. Consequently when he was actually in his 85th or in his 86th year. The speech which he delivered on that occasion was inserted in the viith book of his Origines[30]; the same

19 Plutarch, Vita, xxvii.

20 H. N. xxix. 8: cf. xiv. 5. 39: xv. 20. 209. Cicero, Brutus, 15, 61: 20, 89. Velleius Pat. i. 13.

21 De Officiis, i. 23, 79.

22 H. N. xxii. 6. 212, 213. Velleius Pat. i. 12. Appian, viii. 102. 104. 105.

23 Cf. Livy, Epitome, xlix. Polybius, xxxvi. 6. § 6. Plutarch, Cato Maj. xxvii: Reipublicæ Gerendæ Præc. x. Apophthegmata, Scipion. Junioris, iii. A. Gellius, ix. 14.

24 xxxix. 40. 25 Vita, xv.

26 viii. vii. 1 De Studio et Industria.

27 Vita, xv. 28 Brutus, 17, 65.

29 An seni sit gerenda respublica, ii.

30 Cicero, De Oratore, i. 53, 227. Brutus, 23, 89. A. Gellius, i. 3: xiii. 24. Valerius Max. viii. 1. 2 De Judiciis publicis.

the calendar all this time speaks for itself. There is no portion of the irregular period in general during which less irregularity appears to have been permitted *de facto* than for the remainder of this cycle; so much so that the old rule of administration might have been restored and closely adhered to throughout it. The years alternate common and intercalary; the former 355 days in length, the latter 377 or 378 *pro re nata:* and by this simple management the Nundinal incidence too is kept constantly clear of the Kalends of January.

Nor, though particular proofs of the truth and correctness of our arrangements for the rest of this cycle may be a desi-

book which Cicero supposes him to have had in hand at the assumed date of his own dialogue De Senectute[31]. The whole of these Origines, according to Cornelius Nepos[32], was written when he was *senex:* and they came down to the prætura or official prætorial year of this same Ser. Galba, Qui diripuit Lusitanos[32], and thereby occasioned the rebellion and the long war of Viriathus[33]. This was an act of U. C. 604 B. C. 150[33]. And it was for this that Cato accused him before the people; consequently the very next year, U. C. 605, and in the very last year of his own life. The ivth and vth book of the Origines contained the first and second Punic wars[34]. Pliny has preserved a date contained in these Origines, which shews that they came down to the close of the war with Perseus[35]; B. C. 168 at least: and that fact would be ascertained of the fifth book in particular by the testimony of Livy also[36].

We do not think it necessary to go any further into the personal history of Cato[37]. We will observe only that the Auctor De Viris, in nomine, has this statement concerning him: In prætura Sardiniam subegit[38], ubi ab Ennio Græcis litteris institutus. This prætura is dated by Livy U. C. 556 B. C. 198[39], when Cato must have been only 37 years of age. According to Cicero he learnt Greek when he was old: Ut ego feci qui Græcas litteras senex didici[40]. This statement therefore of the Auctor Anonymus must be in error. According to Cornelius Nepos[41] he brought Ennius from Sardinia when he was quæstor; and, according to Cornelius also, as he was returning from Africa.

31 Cap. 11, 38. 32 Vita, iii. 3.

33 Suetonius, Galba, iii. 4. Cf. Diss. ix. ch. ii. sect. viii. Vol. ii. 243.

34 Cornelius Nepos, Vita, iii. 3. Cf. A. Gellius, iii. 7.

35 H. N. iii. 19. 701.

36 xlv. 25. 16. Cf. A. Gellius, vii. 3. Of these different books, cf. A. Gellius, i. 16: ii. 19. 22. 28: v. 21: x. 1: xi. 1. 3: xv. 9. 13: xvii. 13.

37 Cf. Plutarch, Vita, xxiv. xxvii. Pliny, H. N. vii. 12. 79. Solinus, i. § 59. A. Gellius, xiii. 16.

38 Cf. Plutarch, Vita, vi.

39 xxxii. 7. 8. 27. Cicero, De Senectute, 4, 10. dates it U. C. 550 B. C. 204, Tuditano et Cethego; when Cato was in reality quæstor.

40 De Senectute, 8, 26. Cf. Plutarch, Vita, ii. Academica, iv. 2, 5.

41 Vita, 1. Cf. Jerome in Chron. Olymp. 135. 2.

deratum, are general confirmations of that fact wanting. Circumstantial accounts are still extant (chiefly in Appian) of the war which the Romans were waging all this time with the Celtiberi and the Lusitani; by the help of which it would be easy to shew that the consular year, the natural year, and the military year, for the whole of this period must have been beginning and ending very much alike: and from our Fasti, during the same period, that will appear to have been the case. The consular or official year all this time bore date on the Kalends of January; and the Kalends of January, between U. C. 602 and U. C. 627 B. C. 152 and B. C. 137, according to our arrangements never fell earlier than Jan. 6 nor later than January 26; and that is entirely consistent with every intimation of the actual ingress or egress of the official year, or of the nature and particulars of military proceedings between the same limits, which is still discoverable in Appian or in any other of the historians of the time.

SECTION V.—*On the Chronology of the third Punic war.*

There are also still in existence circumstantial accounts of a part of this period, B. C. 149 to 146; which comprehends the duration of the third Punic war. And though we do not think it necessary, for the sake of illustrating and confirming the arrangements of our calendar through the remainder of this third cycle, to enter upon the consideration of any other part of it in detail; there are special reasons why we should institute something like a particular inquiry into the chronology of the third Punic war: more especially in order to ascertain the true date of the destruction of Carthage, and whether it was earlier or later than that of Corinth, which also happened some time in the course of the same year. The date of this latter event indeed is a question on which we cannot enter at present; but we may have occasion to do so hereafter: and the decision of this present question of the date of the capture and destruction of Carthage will so far prepare the way for that of this future one, of the capture and destruction of Corinth.

i. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iii. 12. 355 *days.*

U. C. 605 Varr. 604 Cap. 602 Polyb. B. C. 149.

L. Marcius Censorinus
Man. Manilius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 24 B. C. 149. Nundinal Char. 2.

The Romans had determined to enter on this third war with the Carthaginians even before the ingress of this consular year[w], the Kalends of January U. C. 605 January 24; and the consuls had received secret instructions not to desist from hostilities until Carthage should have been laid in ruins[x], even before they had set sail to Sicily.

The first thing mentioned is the defection of Utica from the Carthaginians[y]; and that too was announced at Rome before the consuls set sail, and was one of the inducements which contributed to encourage and confirm the Romans in the resolution to which they had come. It may be collected from Polybius and Appian[z], that an embassy from Carthage also must have arrived at Rome soon after this defection, and sent in consequence of it; but they found, as he tells us, both the war already decided upon and the consuls who had been appointed to carry it into execution already departed: and that left them no alternative except to give up the Carthaginians on their own responsibility to *the faith* of the Romans, preliminary to any other conditions which they should think proper to impose[a]. The condition which the Roman senate prescribed in the first instance accordingly, if further consequences were to be avoided, was that the Carthaginians should surrender 300 of their noblest children (or youths) as hostages; which were to be delivered up to the consuls at Lilybæum in Sicily in thirty days' time. And short as the interval was, thus allowed them both for returning home and for deliberating on such a stipulation and for keeping their time in Sicily, it is agreed that the conditions

[w] Appian, viii. 73, 74. Livy, xlix. Valerius Max. ii. ii. 1 De Magistratuum... Officiis.
[x] Appian, viii. 75.
[y] Ibid. Livy, xlix.
[z] xxxvi. 1. Appian, viii. 76. Cf. Livy, xlix.
[a] xxxvi. 1. § 9: 2. § 4. Appian, viii. 76. Livy, xlix.

prescribed were complied with strictly to the letter: Σπουδῇ *προλαβόντες τὴν προθεσμίαν τοὺς παῖδας ἦγον εἰς Σικελίαν*[b].

It is clear then that when these things were passing at Rome the consuls were on their way to Sicily, if not already arrived at Lilybæum; yet not so but that by means of great exertions and despatch the Carthaginian embassy might still be able to return to Carthage and the hostages might still be brought to Sicily and be delivered up there, before the consuls could be ready to sail from thence to Africa. The question is therefore At what time the consuls would most probably set sail to Sicily? And whether in the Roman March, March 21 to April 21, or in the Roman April, April 21 to May 20? And here a fragment of Polybius recovered by Angelo Maio comes in very opportunely to assist our judgment. This fragment is as follows.

Ὅτι προσπεσόντων εἰς τὴν Πελοπόννησον γραμμάτων τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Μανιλίου διότι καλῶς ποιήσουσι τὸν Πολύβιον τὸν Μεγαλοπολίτην ἐκπέμποντες μετὰ σπουδῆς εἰς Λιλύβαιον, ὡς χρείας οὔσης αὐτοῦ δημοσίων ἕνεκα πραγμάτων· ἔδοξε τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς ἐκπέμπειν ἀκολούθως τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑπάτου γεγραμμένοις. ἡμεῖς δὲ νομίζοντες αὐτοῖς καθήκειν κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους τὸ πειθαρχεῖν Ῥωμαίοις, πάντα τἄλλα πάρεργα (θέμενοι), τῆς θερείας ἀρχομένης ἐξεπλεύσαμεν. ἀφικόμενοι δ' εἰς Κέρκυραν, καὶ καταλαβόντες αὖθις γράμματα παρὰ τῶν ὑπάτων προσπεπτωκότα τοῖς Κερκυραίοις, ἐν οἷς διέταξαν ὅτι τοὺς ὁμήρους ἤδη παραδεδώκασιν αὐτοῖς οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι, πάντες δ' (corr. *πάντως δ'*) *ἕτοιμοί εἰσιν αὐτοῖς πειθαρχεῖν· νομίσαντες δὲ (ἤδη) λελύσθαι τὸν πόλεμον καὶ μηκέτι χρείαν ἡμῶν εἶναι μηδεμίαν αὖθις ἀπεπλεύσαμεν εἰς τὴν Πελοπόννησον*[c].

Ἀρχομένης *θερείας* in the idiom of Polybius commonly means the beginning of the Achæan year, which bore date from the Πλειάδων *ἐπιτολή* (at least in the rectified years of the cycle); the same natural term which in the Parapegmata of the Greeks defined the Ἀρχὴ *θέρους*. And such must have been its meaning in the present instance, B. C. 149, Period i. 74 of the Achæan calendar; when the head of the year was falling on May 9, only three days later than May 6, the Ἀρχὴ *θέρους* itself. We may conclude then that Polybius must

[b] Appian, viii. 77. 79. Polybius, xxxvi. 2. § 6-9: 3. § 6-9. Livy, xlix. Diodorus, Fragm. lib. xxxii. Zonaras, ix. 26. 463 A.

[c] Excepta Vaticana, Polyb. xxxiv—xxxvii. cap. vii.

have received this summons to Lilybæum at the beginning of May; and therefore that the consuls must have arrived in Sicily by the second or third week in April, which would be some time in the Roman March, March 21 and April 21.

Between these same dates consequently must the Carthaginian embassy also have come to Rome and had its audience there; and as we may very probably conjecture between March 21 and 30. For the thirty days which were to be allowed them both for returning home and for bringing the hostages to Sicily were the measure of one integral month, according to their own calendar. The Punic Thoth Nab. 599 bore date October 2 B. C. 150; and therefore the Punic Phamenoth March 30 B. C. 149: and there would seem to be every reason to conclude from this coincidence that the 30 days, which were allowed them in this first instance, were the actual measure of this same month Phamenoth, March 30 to April 29. In which case, the hostages having been delivered up on or before April 28, B. C. 149; if the consuls wrote word to that effect to Corcyra with little or no delay, Polybius must have met with that intelligence just about the time at which he gives us to understand he actually did so; i. e. soon after May 9. He returned home in consequence of this first report; but he must some time or other either have been again summoned by the consuls or have repaired to the scene of the war of his own accord (and probably in that case to join his friend Scipio the younger there): for he was present in Africa, as Appian tells us[d], down to the destruction of Carthage; and was himself an eyewitness of that event.

The hostages received at Lilybæum were committed by the consuls to the custody of the prætor of Sicily[e], Quintus Fabius Maximus; and it may be collected from Polybius[e] that they did not themselves resume their voyage to Africa nor land with the army at Utica, until they had heard of the safe arrival of these hostages at Rome: which is sufficient to convict the Epitome of Livy[f] of being in error, in supposing that even these hostages were delivered up to the consuls first only after they had landed in Africa.

[d] viii. 132. Cf. Pliny, H. N. v. 1. 255. Appian, viii. 77, 78. Diodorus, Frag. xxxii.

[e] Polybius, xxxvi. 3. § 8, 9: 4 § 1.

[f] xlix.

The actual time of the landing in Africa, under these circumstances, would probably be towards the end of May [g]. The proceedings which ensued after the landing, including the delivery up by the Carthaginians of their arms and munitions of war, (of all their existing means of offence or of defence,) before the final conditions required by the Romans, which ultimately led to the war, were made known to them [h], appear to have been sufficient to occupy the remainder of the month of May. It is mentioned that even after the Carthaginians had come to the resolution of resisting to the last extremity they sent to the consuls to request another 30 days' suspension of hostilities, Ἵνα πρεσβεύσειαν εἰς Ῥώμην [i]: and though that was refused them, yet even these 30 days too might have been intended to bear date from the first of Pachon arrived or at hand, May 29.

The consuls waited a few days even after this before they began to act on the offensive [k]; and during that time the Carthaginians were making incredible exertions to place themselves once more in a state of defence [k]. The actual commencement then of the siege of Carthage can scarcely be dated from an earlier point of time than the first or the second week in June B. C. 149; and if it lasted three years, and three complete, as Appian implies that it did [l]; at whatsoever time in June B. C. 149 it began, it could not have been over before the same time in June B. C. 146.

Now very soon after the actual commencement of the siege an allusion occurs to the Κυνὸς ἐπιτολή [m]; the date of which in the Julian calendar of after-times was July 19, and in the Egyptian, with which Appian himself was most likely to be familiar, was July 20 or 21 [n]: and though this was the date of that phenomenon in strictness only as adapted to the latitude of Memphis, and the latitude of Carthage was 6° more to the north than that of Memphis; it would not be materially in error even for the latter. This allusion therefore is a decisive criterion of the season of the year to which it belongs; and if it was really intended of July 20 or 21 it

[g] Appian, viii. 78. Polybius, xxxvi. 4 § 1. Diodor. Fr. xxxii.

[h] Appian, viii. 78—92. Polybius, xxxvi. 4. § 3—6. Diodor. Fr. xxxii. Strabo, xvii. 3. Zonaras, ix. 27. 463 B.

[i] Appian, viii. 93.

[k] Ibid. 94. Strabo, xvii. 3.

[l] Appian, viii. 132.

[m] Ibid. 99: 97: 98.

[n] See our Fasti Catholici, iii. 52, 53.

confirms our reasonings hitherto. From the account also of the contest on each side both before and after this note of time; it may be fairly inferred that the point of time denoted by this Κυνὸς ἐπιτολὴ must have coincided with that period of the lunar revolution when the nights were light, and operations whether of offence or of defence might be carried on in the night-time as well as by day: i. e. in fact, with the full of the moon, or about it. Now there was a lunar eclipse June 21 at 8.30 A. M. Paris, this year; and therefore there must have been a full moon again on or about July 20. It appears too from our calendar that the first of Quinctilis this year fell on July 19, and the second on July 20; and that would be a means of perpetuating the knowledge of these dates: viz. that in the first year of the siege of Carthage, U. C. 605, the stated date of the Κυνὸς ἐπιτολὴ fell at the beginning of the Roman Quinctilis.

The Roman comitia are soon after alluded to as already at hand; and Censorinus, one of the consuls, is said to have returned to Rome at that juncture in order to preside at them[o]: Μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολὺ Κηνσωρῖνος μὲν ἐς Ῥώμην ᾤχετο ἀρχαιρεσιάσων: and yet, even after his departure for that purpose, it is clear from the context that the harvest was scarcely yet over in the surrounding country[p]. We may suppose then that he returned to Rome early in Quinctilis, the limits of which were July 19 and August 19; and that the comitia were expected to be held in Sextilis or September: i. e. about their usual time under ordinary circumstances, now that the consular ingress was bearing date on the Kalends of January; three or four months before the end of the official year.

Manilius was left to prosecute the siege; but Zonaras gives us to understand that on the arrival of autumn, or the sickly season properly so called, he too must virtually have raised it for a time, in order to retire to a more healthy situation[q]: nor is there any thing on record in Appian[r], which would imply the contrary. He mentions only the coming of delegates from Rome, to make a report of the state of things in

[o] Appian, viii. 99. Livy, xlix. Cf. Orosius, iv. 22.

[p] Appian, viii. 100.

[q] ix. 26. 464 A.

[r] viii. 100—104. Cf. Diodorus, Fragm. xxxii. This was the occasion when Scipio earned the Corona obsidionalis: supra, 200, note.

Africa from their own observation; and after their return, of the mission of another embassy to Masinissa[s]. Even after the return of Censorinus to Rome there would still be time B. C. 149 for the despatch of both these embassies, and for their coming back, before the beginning of winter.

ii. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iii. 13. 378 days.

U. C. 606 Varr. 605 Cap. 603 Polyb. B. C. 148.

Sp. Postumius Albinus Magnus
L. Calpurnius Piso Cæsoninus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 13 B. C. 148. Nundinal Char. 7.

The death of Masinissa appears to have happened between the end of the preceding military year, and the beginning of this[t]; and consequently so must the division of his dominions by Scipio Æmilianus, among his children, a few days after his death, have fallen out too. Manilius is spoken of as still in command Ἀρχομένου τοῦ ἔαρος[u]; and this, in our opinion, was also the time of the second attempt on Nepheris, made by him before the arrival of his successor[w]: in the course of which too the Numidian Phameas or Himilco[x], one of the most active partisans of the Carthaginians, but whose fidelity to them had been previously shaken by the influence of Scipio in the course of the preceding winter[y], went over to the Romans.

It appears to us too to be intimated in the account of this transaction, that the junction of Himilco with the Romans at last took place on a moonlight night[z]. There would be a full moon, B. C. 148, both March 14 and April 12; about the time of one of which also this expedition against Ne-

[s] viii. 105. Livy, l. One of these legati was Claudius Marcellus; cast away either on the way to Africa, or in returning thence: see supra, p. 38, note. It must have been near the end of B.C. 149 when this embassy was sent; and bad weather might then naturally have been encountered.

[t] Appian, viii. 105, 106. Polybius, xxxvii. 3. § 1–10: 11, 12. Livy, li. Diodorus, Fr. xxxii. Eutropius, iv. 5. Zonaras, ix. 27. 465 A. Valerius Max. v. ii. 4 De Gratitudine, Externa. Scipionium Scipiones, i. 2.

[u] Zonaras, ix. 27. 465 B. 29. 467 A. It appears from Valerius Max. loc. cit. that when Masinissa wrote to Manilius, from his death-bed, to send Scipio to him, he was commanding Proconsule; that is it was after the Kalends of January U. C. 606 Jan. 13 B. C 148.

[w] Appian, viii. 108, 109.

[x] Ibid. 100. Livy, li. Eutropius, iv. 5.

[y] Appian, viii. 107.

[z] Ibid. 108, 109.

pheris, in our opinion, was going on. It continued seventeen days; for the last three of which the supplies of the Romans had failed them[z]. It might begin about the first of the Roman March, April 3, and last to the seventeenth, April 19: in which case the full moon April 12 would fall about the middle point between.

Manilius heard directly after[a] that his successor was on the road to supersede him; in consequence of which he sent Scipio and Phameas to Rome: and, though Zonaras spoke of him[b] as still commanding in the absence of Piso Ἀρχομένου ἔαρος, yet even Piso's arrival at last is dated by Appian Ἅμα ἦρι[c]; so that the events just before related, including the expedition to Nepheris and the junction of Phameas, must have happened critically between the termination of the winter and the beginning of the spring quarter of this year. The time of the actual arrival of Piso in his province was probably the month of May. From the time of this arrival to that of his going into winter quarters, he appears to have been employed by the operations against Hippagreta[d]; a city situated midway between Carthage and Utica, the Ἵππου ἄκρα of Diodorus[e]: Ἡ μεγάλη τε ἦν καὶ τείχεσι καὶ ἀκροπόλει καὶ λιμέσι καὶ νεωρίοις ὑπ' Ἀγαθοκλέους.....κατεσκεύαστο. The whole of the summer was spent in the siege of this place; and the army afterwards went into winter quarters at Utica: not however long before the time of holding the consular comitia at Rome; which did not actually take place there before it was known that the army had gone into quarters for the winter[f].

We have already observed that Scipio had been sent to Rome before the arrival of Piso. He could not have returned to Africa again in the course of this present year. It is agreed that though only of the legal age of the Ædileship, (and in fact only a candidate for the Ædileship at the time,) he was unanimously elected consul at the comitia of the year[g]; the Lex Annalis or Villia * having been purposely dispensed

* Of this Law, see Livy, xl. 44: U. C. 574 B. C. 181—180; cf. 35. It

[z] Appian, loc. cit.
[a] Ibid. viii. 109.
[b] Loco cit. Cf. ix. 29. 467 B.
[c] viii. 110.
[d] Ibid.
[e] xx. 55. Cf. 57.
[f] Appian, viii. 112.
[g] Ibid. Livy, l: li. Zonaras, ix. 29. 467 A.

with in his behalf. The Roman comitia of this year would probably be held in Sextilis, September 1—30. B. C. 148: and this is confirmed by the fact that the account of Scipio's election at Rome comes in just after that of the death of Hasdrubal (the son of the daughter of Masinissa, and nephew of Gulussa) at Carthage[h]; which there is every reason to believe could have preceded only by a little the regular termination of the Carthaginian year of office, September 30. For he was assassinated and in the senate-house, while still in office as the prætor of the year, Στρατηγός; and his death was the effect of the machinations of the other Hasdrubal[i], who was plotting to supersede him: and actually succeeded him at this time; and was still in office at the time of the capture and destruction of Carthage itself[k]: having forcibly maintained himself in possession after he had been once appointed. The official year of the Carthaginians then and the Roman comitia for the election of consuls B. C. 148 must have been falling out much at the same time;

gave the cognomen of Annalis to Villius the Tribunus Plebis who caused it to be passed: cf. xlii. 28. 31. L. Villius Annalis, U. C. 583 B. C. 172—171. Festus calls it the Lex Annaria; i. 29. 13 Annaria: cf. Historiæ Aug. SS. Commodus, 2. Appian would imply that Scipio was under the consular age, not only on this occasion, when elected consul the first time, but even on the second, B. C. 134, when elected to take the command in the siege of Numantia: vi. 84. Cf. Livy, lvi. Appian, B. C. i. 100. But that was a mistake. Scipio was 17 years of age at the battle of Pydna, B. C. 168. (Cf. Livy, xliv. 44. Diodorus Sic. xxx. Plutarch, Æmilius Paullus, xxii.) And if that implies that he was then in his 17th year, he must have been born B. C. 184; and therefore would be in his 37th year (36 complete) B. C. 148: and in his 51st (50 complete) B. C. 134. Velleius Paterculus (ii. 4. 12.) tells us accordingly that he was 36 when elected consul B. C. 148; and in his 56th year at the time of his death, B. C. 129. Cf. Appian, B. C. i. 19-20. According to Polybius, (xxxii. 10. § 1: 11. § 8: 13. § 6: 14. § 1: 8. § 1. cf. Diodorus, Fr. xxxi.) he was 24 at the death of Æmilius Paullus, his father, B. C. 160; and that too would suppose him to have been born B. C. 184. Plutarch, Apophthegmata, i. makes him only 54 at his death.

We learn from these facts that the legal age of the Ædileship was 36 complete. That of the Consulship was 42 or 43 complete.

[h] Appian, viii. 111. Cf. Livy, li.
[i] Appian, viii. 70: 73: 102: 108-111.
[k] Ibid. 131.

and as the date of the former was September 30 or October 1, that of the latter must have been about the same time.

iii. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iii. 14. 355 days.

U. C. 607 Varr. 606 Cap. 604 Polyb. B. C. 147.

P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus Aimilianus
C. Livius Drusus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 26 B. C. 147. Nundinal Char. 5.

After the return of Scipio to Africa, to take the command in his proper consular year, U. C. 607 B. C. 147[l], operations are brought down to the end of summer[m], or the beginning of winter[n], the same year; though nothing very important appears on record. We learn however from Strabo[o] that one of the intermediate events, the excavation of the new Cotho or harbour, by the Carthaginians, and the construction of the fleet with which they engaged the Romans, took up two months.

In the ensuing winter the principal event was the reduction of Nepheris; the siege of which lasted twenty-two days, and according to Appian in the severest part of the season[p]. That this season was protracted into the winter of B. C. 146, and therefore into the next consular year, there can be no doubt. All this time, to judge from the context of our accounts, Scipio had desisted from active operations against Carthage, and was trusting to the effect of a blockade, and to the gradual failure of supplies; the sources of which he was cutting off in every direction.

[l] Appian, viii. 113, 114. 134. Livy, li. Diodorus Sic. iii. 44.
[m] Ibid. 113–125. [n] Ibid. 126. [p] viii. 126. Livy, li.
[o] xvii. 3. Cf. Appian, viii. 121–123:

iv. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iii. 15. 355 *days.*

U. C. 608 Varr. 607 Cap. 605 Polyb. B. C. 146.

Cn. Cornelius Lentulus
L. Mummius.

Kalendæ Januariæ January 16 B. C. 146. Nundinal Char. 2.

The resumption of offensive proceedings against Carthage is dated by Appian Ἀρχομένου ἦρος [q], with the attack on the Cotho and on that part of the city which was called Byrsa (the original Carthage of Dido). This is demonstrative that the siege was actually protracted into the spring quarter of B. C. 146; though it must be confessed that after this resumption of active operations, beginning with the assault on the Cotho, the notices of time, successively specified by Appian [r] at least, do not amount to more than seven or eight days, before the city was already in the power of the Romans.

The question is then what meaning must be attached to this phrase of Ἀρχομένου ἦρος? whether that of some time in the natural year as early as March or April, or that of some time as late as April or May? In our opinion the latter only could be intended by it: and the analogy of every other instance of the use of the same phrase by Appian in the course of the same war leads to that conclusion. And that the proceedings of this last year of the siege must have been protracted much beyond the proper beginning of spring B. C. 146 may be inferred from the fragments of Polybius; in which there is an allusion to the approach of the Roman comitia and to the probable election of a successor to Scipio not long before the final reduction of the city [s]. It is in our power however to decide this question by actually assigning within certain limits the date of the destruction of Carthage; if not the very day itself.

By the Auctor De Viris illustribus [t] it is asserted that P. Scipio Æmilianus Cum Ædilitatem peteret consul ante

[q] viii. 127, 128. Livy, lii. Zonaras, ix. 29. 468 B. 30. 469 C.
[r] viii. 127: 130.
[s] Cf. xxxix. 2. § 2—5.
[t] Publius Scipio Æmilianus.

annos ultro factus Carthaginem intra sex menses delevit. The first part of this statement is undoubtedly true; but as to the second, if that also is true, it follows that Scipio must have taken and destroyed Carthage within six months after the ingress of his consular year, the Kalends of January U. C. 607, January 26 B. C. 147: and that would unquestionably be false. It is certain that Carthage was taken and destroyed by Scipio in his *Proconsular* year, B. C. 146, not in his *consular*, B. C. 147. It is certain that he celebrated his triumph for that success, the same year, B. C. 146 and Proconsule[u]; and 14 years[w] before his second, over Numantia, B. C. 132.

Either then this statement of the Auctor Anonymus must be rejected *in toto*, or, if there was any foundation for it, (as there probably was,) the only mode of explaining it, and of making it consistent with the actual course of events, will be to assume that in his text as it stood originally it must have been asserted that Scipio destroyed Carthage Intra *annum et* sex menses * from the ingress of his consular year. Such a statement as that would be entirely consistent with all which we have as yet been able to collect of the actual course of events before and after the time when he assumed the command; and with all which is known from testimony of the actual termination of the war. But it will imply that, as Scipio's consular year was dated from the Kalends of January U. C. 607, Carthage was taken by him and destroyed at the end of the Roman June U. C. 608.

The language of this author is strictly to be taken into account. The word which he uses to express the event of the war is *Delevit*; and that means total and entire destruction. Now both Florus and Orosius[x] tell us, (and Livy no doubt had the same statement,) that the conflagration of the city lasted *seventeen* days. Appian also certifies us that it was given up to pillage even after the fire for some days[y]. He informs us too that all was over before Scipio sent word of

* Just as Velleius Pat. (ii. 4) says that he took and destroyed Numantia also, Intra annum ac tres menses quam eo venerat.

u Appian, viii. 135. Livy, lii.
w Livy, lix. Eutropius, iv. 8. Cicero, liii. Philippica, xi. 8, 18.
x Florus, ii. 15. § 12—19. Orosius, iv. 22: 23.
y viii. 133.

his success to Rome[y]; though Zonaras would give us to understand that he sent word of the capture first, and destroyed the city at last in obedience to orders received from the senate[z]. It is clear that on these points the accounts of Appian are the most consistent and most entitled to credit; nor need we wonder at that, if they were principally derived from Polybius, who was a spectator of every thing which happened, and *as* it happened.

The drift of these observations is That the *deletion* of Carthage, the total destruction of that unfortunate city, which the Auctor De Viris supposes to have been completed before the end of June Roman in Scipio's Proconsular year U. C. 608, must take in these seventeen days' conflagration, followed by a certain number of days of pillage; both together very probably not less than 20: so that though Carthage itself might be already in the power of the Romans soon after the beginning of the Roman June it could not yet have been totally destroyed and buried in its own ruins much before the end. Appian himself reckons the length of the siege at three years, and as his language implies three complete[a]; and as he himself proves that it did not begin until the month of June Roman U. C. 605 he could not have supposed that it was over before the month of June Roman U. C. 608.

If indeed it is true, (as Plutarch informs us[b], and as we may probably have occasion to inquire more particularly hereafter,) that the greatest misfortunes which ever befell the Carthaginians were known to have happened on the 22d of some one or other of their months; what calamity could have happened greater than this last of the total destruction of their city? What national misfortune then of theirs may more probably be supposed to have borne date on that ominous day of the month? Now the Punic Pachon Nab. 602 would bear date on May 29 B. C. 146; and the 22d of Pachon on June 19: and that day in the Roman calendar U. C. 608 coincided with vii Idus Junias, June 7 Roman. It ap-

[y] viii. 133.

[z] ix. 30. 469 C D.

[a] viii. 132: 134. Cf. Orosius, iv. 23. Ita *quarto* quam inceptum fuit anno bellum Punicum tertium terminatum est. It lasted therefore three years complete and part of a *fourth*.

[b] Camillus, xix.

pears from Appian that, after the attack and capture of the Cotho[c], when the assault on the Byrsa also began, there were six days and nights of continued fighting[d]; and that the city was taken and the surviving defenders of the city surrendered on the seventh[e]. These seven days might be the first seven days of the Roman June; and the last of them, the vii Idus Junias, would be the ominous 22d of the current Punic month. Moreover six days and nights of incessant attack and defence argue a time of the lunar month when there must have been moonlight; and there was actually a full moon June 18 or 19 B. C. 146: so that these seven days from June 13 to 19 inclusive would coincide with the second quarter of that moon, when there would be every night more and more light until the full.

The city having thus become completely at the mercy of the Romans on the seventh of the Roman June; the work of pillage and spoliation would begin as soon as the fire was extinguished: and both that and the 17 days' conflagration nevertheless might be over by the 29th of the month, 22 days after the seventh. And thus the statement of the Auctor De Viris, rightly understood, would turn out to be strictly true; that Carthage was actually taken and actually destroyed by Scipio within six months from the beginning of his pro-consular year: that is, by the end of Junius U. C. 608, and by July 12 B. C. 146.

It may be collected also from Appian's account of the reception of the news of this event at Rome at last[f], that it must have arrived when the nights were light all through, and yet just before the stated time of some games; which appear to have been so close at hand that they were already in course the very next morning[g]. Now these could have been none other but the Ludi Apollinares; Pridie Nonas

[c] viii. 127.
[d] Ibid. 128—130.
[e] Ibid. 130: 131: 132.
[f] Ibid. 134.
[g] Ibid. 135. We shewed supra, Vol. ii. 667, that the Ludi Sæculares were probably instaurated this year, and on June 13, as a means of ensuring the successful termination of the war. It could not have been known at Rome by June 13, that Carthage was already taken. And yet it is a singular coincidence that this was the first of the six days, as we have concluded, at the end of which it fell into the hands of the Romans. Is it inconceivable that Scipio might know even in Africa that the secular games would be renewed at Rome on this day and with this object in view? and might purposely make choice of the same day for his last attack?

Quinctiles U. C. 608, July 17 B. C. 146, the very day before the full of the moon, July 18: which, it must be admitted, is a remarkable confirmation of our preceding dates. Nor would it be any thing impossible that the news of the fate of Carthage, though despatched from that quarter only on July 11 *, should yet have been received at Rome, in the summer time, on July 16.

Lastly, the games which Scipio is said to have celebrated Ἐπὶ τῇ νικῇ [h] on this occasion in imitation of what his father had done after the battle of Pydna, to judge from the context of Appian, could not have been celebrated before the arrival of the ten commissioners, despatched from Rome upon the receipt of the news of the destruction of Carthage, in order to assist him in settling the affairs of Africa. It is not probable that these could have arrived in time to celebrate any such games according to the Olympic rule, B. C. 146, July 20—25; or that Scipio himself could have been ready with his preparations for them in so short a time. It is more probable that they were celebrated, as the last thing which he did in Africa, after executing the orders of the senate; and just before his return to his Triumph †.

* It appears from Appian, (viii. 133,) that Scipio sent the news by one of the fastest sailing of his ships; not however before the capture of the city was complete. Most probably therefore about the end of June Roman. The city was set on fire, (Appian, viii. 128.) apparently by order of Scipio, just when he was arrived at the Byrsa, and on the point of storming it; and that seems to have been about the middle of the six days' contest: if so, June 9 Roman. Reckon 17 days from this inclusive, and two or three more for the pillage of the city after the fire had been extinguished; viii. 133: and that will give the close of these proceedings, and the probable time of the mission of the news to Rome, about 20 days after June 9; i. e. June 29. So that the ship was probably sent on June 29 Roman, July 11; and in that case it might easily arrive with the news on July 15. There are instances on record of the passage from Carthage to Rome having been made in three days' time.

† We learn from various other quarters that the spoils or trophies which the Carthaginians had taken at different times from the Greeks, (especially those of Sicily,) and had brought to Carthage, were restored to their owners by Scipio on this occasion: such as the Bull of Phalaris, to the Agrigentines, &c.: Diodorus, xiii. 90: Frag. xxxiii. Scholia in Pin-

[h] Appian, viii. 135. Livy, li.

SECTION VI.—*Administration of the Calendar during the three years of the third Punic war.*

To conclude then with one observation more on the administration of the calendar during this period of the third Punic war.

The above representation of the actual course of things supposes two common years in sequence, B. C. 147 and 146, instead of the regular alternation of common and intercalary years which had previously been observed in this cycle. But B. C. 147. U. C. 607 the Kalends of January had mounted upwards to January 26; 29 days, or one mensis cavus, above their date U. C. 601 December 28 B. C. 154: and that was a greater degree of irregularity than the administrators of the calendar at this time might be disposed to allow of. We may observe that they had again reached the same point in advance U. C. 616 B. C. 138; and the same expedient of two common years in sequence, B. C. 138 and 137, was then also resorted to, in order to reduce this excess from January 26 to January 5. In short this cycle exhibits clear proofs, from first to last, that whosoever had the care of the calendar at this time (and it must have been P. Scipio Nasica) it was administered with as much regularity, and with as close an attention to the old and proper rule, as under the circumstances of the case, and with a constant precaution against a particular form of the Nundinal incidence, was possible.

darum, Pythia, i. 185. Appian, viii. 133. Valerius Max. v. 1. 6 De Humanitate. Cicero, Oratio vii. In Verrem, ii. lib. ii. 2, 4: 35, 86: Orat. ix. iv. 33, 73: Orat. x. v. 72, 185. Asconius, p. 5. in Divin.: 28. in ii. Contra Verrem: 49. in iii. Contra Verrem.

DISSERTATION XVI.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar. Cycle iv. and v.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 1. 378 *days.*

U. C. 618 Varr. 617 Cap. 615 Polyb. B. C. 136.

P. Furius Philus
Sex. Atilius Serranus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 5 B. C. 136. Nundinal Char. 8.

Callaïc Triumph of D. Junius Brutus.

A date which belongs to this year is recoverable from the Fasti of Ovid.

Tum sibi Callaïco Brutus cognomen in hoste
Fecit, et Hispanam sanguine tinxit humum[i].

The day of which he was speaking was the feast-day of Vesta[k], the Vestalia, the v Idus Junias, June 9 Roman, both in the old calendar and in the Julian[l]. The Brutus here alluded to was Decimus Junius Brutus (styled by Appian Sextus Junius Brutus, by Velleius Pat. Aulus Brutus[m]) consul along with P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio U. C. 616 B. C. 138; surnamed Callaïcus in consequence of this

[i] vi. 461. [k] vi. 249. [l] Maffæan, Venusinc, Calendar, apud Foggini.
[m] vi. 71. Vell. Pat. ii. 5.

victory over the Callaïci, a tribe of the Lusitani in Spain. We have had occasion to speak of him in a former part of our work[n], as a learned man, and a patron of letters; and as probably better acquainted with the nature and constitution of the old Roman calendar than most of his contemporaries.

His campaigns in Lusitania and this victory of his in particular are alluded to by all the historians of the period to which it belongs[o]: but Ovid only has preserved its date. And as he was consul U. C. 616 B. C. 138, and was probably sent into Spain that year; even the year might have been doubtful, did not Orosius[p] fix it to the year of the city next after the consular year of M. Æmilius Lepidus Porcina and C. Hostilius Mancinus, U. C. 617 B. C. 137. Consequently to U. C. 618 B. C. 136: in which too Orosius is confirmed by the Epitome of Livy[q]. In the Iberica of Appian the particulars of this victory seem to have been related in that part of his context where there happens at present to be an hiatus[r] *.

U. C. 618 the Vestalia June 9 Roman corresponded to July 3 B. C. 136. Brutus' triumph for this victory was celebrated four years afterwards, B. C. 132; in the same year, if not at the same time of the year also, as that of Scipio De Numantinis[s]: but the dates of both have been lost out of the Fasti. This Brutus was instrumental in gaining another victory B. C. 129, in the consular year of C. Sempronius Tuditanus; De Iapudibus[t].

* It appears from Orosius, v. 5, that Brutus' success on this occasion was a very signal one; out of 60,000 of the enemy 50,000 having been killed on the field, and 6000 made prisoners: so that Ovid might well say of him that on this occasion

Hispanam sanguine tinxit humum.

[n] Diss. ii. ch. i. sect. x. i. Vol. i. 98.

[o] Appian, vi. 71—73: 80—82: 99. Livy, lv. lvi. Velleius Pat. ii. 5. Valerius Max. vi. iv. 1 De Graviter dictis, Externa. Strabo, iii. 3. Diodorus, xxxiii. 5. SS. Deperditi, ii. 99. Cicero, Brutus, 22, 85. Frontinus, iv. i. 20. Florus, ii. 17. § 12. Eutropius, iv. 8.

[p] v. 4. 5.

[q] lvi. Cf. Appian, vi. 79: 80—82.

[r] vi. 72. Cf. 80—82.

[s] Eutropius, iv. 8. Plutarch, Tiberius Gracchus, xxi.

[t] See Vol. ii. 88. No. lxxxvii.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 4. 355 *days.*

U. C. 621 Varr. 620 Cap. 618 Polyb. B.C. 134–133.

P. Mucius Scævula
L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 29 B. C. 134. Nundinal Char. 8.

i. *On the day of the death of* Tiberius Gracchus.

The beginning of those proceeding at Rome, which terminated in the death of Tiberius Gracchus, is dated by Velleius Paterculus[u] in the consular year of P. Mucius Scævula and L. Calpurnius; clxii years before his own time, U. C. 783 A. D. 30: i. e. U. C. 621 B. C. 133. Velleius in this statement is confirmed by Plutarch also[w]. The degradation of Octavius, his colleague in the tribuneship, by his procuration, and his own death[x], both came in the compass of one year; and that the consular year of Mucius Scævula in particular, whom Plutarch calls Τὸν *νομοδείκτην*[y].

It is necessary to begin with fixing the year of this event, in order to illustrate the truth of our calendar, and more particularly the Nundinal cycle of the calendar, by means of its circumstances. It is agreed that when Tiberius had effected the degradation of Octavius, and the election of Mummius, (or as Plutarch styles him Mucius[z],) in his stead; he began to take measures for continuing himself in the office of tribune for another year[a], though that was contrary to law. In one of the fragments of Dio[b] it seems to be implied that this was done Ἐπ' *ἐξόδῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς*; but it is clear from the narrative of Appian[c] that, unless the end of the tribunician year

[u] ii. 2.
[w] Vita, ix. xix.
[x] Appian, B.C. i. 10—12: 13—17. Florus, iii. 14. § 4—6. Obsequens, cxxx. lxxxvi. Dio, xlvi. 49.
[y] Vita, ix. Cf. Cicero, Oratio ix. in Verrem, iv. 49, 108: xxix, Pro Domo, 34, 91: xxxi, Pro Cn. Plancio, 36, 88: Ad Attic. i. 19: De Legibus, iii. 9, 20. Asconius, in ii. contra Verr. p. 41. Velleius Pat. ii. 2. 7. Livy, lviii. lix. Valerius Max. iii. ii. 17 De Fortitudine: iv. vii. 1. De Amicitia. Obsequens, lxxxvi. Appian, B.C. 1. 3. 17, 121. Dio, Fragm. lxxxvii. lxxxviii. Auctor De Viris, Tib. Gracchus.
[z] Vita, xiii. xviii. Cf. Appian, B.C. i. 13. 14.
[a] Appian, B.C. i. 13. 14. Livy, lviii. Plutarch, Tiberius Gracchus, xvi.
[b] lxxxviii.
[c] B. C. i. 14.

at this time was falling in the middle of summer, that could not possibly have been the case.

The proceedings relating to his reelection occupied only two days[d]. Gracchus himself was killed on the second day[e]. The comitia tribunicia of the year must consequently have been fixed for the first of these days, though the election was protracted over that day into a second. Now it may be inferred from the testimony of Cæsar[f] that the general rule which regulated the tribunitian elections in these times was to hold the comitia in the eighth month of the tribunitian year, which would be the Roman Quinctilis or Sextilis. And if such was the custom at this period in general, we may take it for granted that Tiberius' comitia, preparatory to an election which he was anxious on many accounts to carry with as little delay as possible, would be no exception to the rule. The Roman Quinctilis U. C. 621 bore date June 23 B. C. 133; the Roman Sextilis July 24: and if the comitia were actually fixed to either of those months, nothing would be more in accordance with such a date than Appian's description of the time when notice was actually given of them: Θέρος δ' ἦν ἤδη, καὶ προγραφαὶ δημάρχων εἰς τὸ μέλλον[g].

This however is not all. The rustic tribes were those by whose assistance Gracchus had been enabled to carry the recent measure relating to the degradation of Octavius[h]; and it would seem from Appian[i] that for this reason both the original motion which had been opposed by him and this subsequent question of his degradation had been purposely fixed by Tiberius for a Nundinal day: when the Nundinal resort alone would necessarily bring the rustic voters to the city in greater numbers than usual. And it was just as natural and just as much to be expected that for the same reason he would fix his own election for a Nundinal day.

The former proceedings however in both instances had taken place either in the spring or before the summer at least was yet much advanced. There had consequently been nothing to interfere with the resort of the rustic tribes to the

[d] Appian, B. C. i. 14–16. Cf Plutarch, Vita, xvi–xix. xx.
[e] Appian, B. C. i. 14. 15. 16. Cf. Plutarch, Vita, xvi–xviii. xix.
[f] De Bello Civili, i. 5.
[g] B. C. i. 14. Cf Florus, iii. 14. § 6.
[h] B. C. i. 12. 13. Plutarch, Vita, x–xii.
[i] B. C. i. 10–12.

city on each of those occasions; and having done that accordingly, and having rendered this service to Tiberius[k], they had returned to their homes and to their usual occupations in the country. But now, it appears, when their attendance in person at Rome was still more necessary to him, both for the success of the measure which he was endeavouring to carry in his own behalf and for his own protection, it turned out that at the time fixed for his reelection they were not at liberty to come to the city[l]; and the reason assigned by Appian for that inability is critically *this*, that, Ὡς ἐν θέρει, they were busy with the harvest. The non-attendance of his rustic supporters at the time of need compelled him to put off the election to the next day[m]; in order to give him time and opportunity meanwhile for canvassing the city voters, and for engaging their sympathies in his own behalf.

It follows from this representation of the course of things that Tiberius' comitia in the present instance must have been fixed for some day either at the beginning of corn harvest, or in the midst of it; as well as, in all probability, for some Nundinal day too. Now such a date as the Kalends of Quinctilis U. C. 621, June 23 B. C. 133, was not likely to have interfered with corn harvest this year; for it could scarcely have begun by so early a day as June 23[n]: much less have been so far advanced that even a day could not have been spared from it by any of the residents in the country to go and vote at Rome. The Kalends of Sextilis however, the same year, July 24, must have fallen in the very midst of corn harvest; which could not fail to have begun in all parts of the country before that day, and at that very time would be going on most actively every where.

Neither however is even this all. It may be collected from the circumstances of these proceedings which are still on record[o] that the night of the day before, and that of the day after, the death of Tiberius was light, and as it would seem both at the beginning and at the end; i. e. all through: and if that was actually the case it is an infallible criterion of the

[k] B. C. i. 13.
[l] B. C. i. 14. Plutarch, Vita, xvi.
[m] B. C. i. 14. 15.
[n] Diss. viii. ch. i. sect ii. Vol. ii. 139.
[o] Appian, B. C. i. 14. 15. Plutarch, Vita, xvi. xx.

full of the moon about the same time. Now there was a solar eclipse August 7 9.45 P. M. Paris, B. C. 133; and consequently there must have been a full moon July 23 or 24 before. If so there would be moonlight all night both on the Kalends of Sextilis U. C. 621 July 24, and on the day before it also.

Finally, the Nundinal character of the year being 8 and the length of the year being 355 days, the character of Sextilis was 8; and Pridie Kalendas Sextiles, Quinctilis 31, July 23 was Nundinal: but not the Kalends of Sextilis July 24. We are altogether of opinion, on the strength of these coincidences, that the actual date of the death of Tiberius Gracchus was this day, the Kalends of Sextilis U. C. 621, July 24 B. C. 133; that he purposely fixed the comitia for his reelection previously to Pridie Kalendas Sextiles, July 23, both because of the Nundinal day and because of the full moon: in the hope that a sufficient number of voters from the country to secure his object might have been induced thereby to come and vote, notwithstanding the business of the harvest, which was going on at the time; and that finding himself disappointed in this expectation on the first day, as the only alternative left, he put off the decision of the election until the next day: in the hope of being able during the remainder of that first day and during the ensuing night to make amends for the absence of his supporters from the country by engaging the city tribes in his interest. It should be observed that on both the former occasions of their attendance the rustic tribes were personally concerned in the questions at issue; and came as much on their own account as on that of Gracchus. But on *this* occasion they had no personal interest in the decision of the question. They might not therefore care to leave their own business at home, just when it was most necessary that they should be attending to it, merely to oblige Gracchus by going to vote at Rome. Certain at least it is that the defect of his usual supporters from the country encouraged and emboldened his opponents to take advantage of this opportunity; as something which had not been expected and might not again recur: for on this second day of the election, headed by the Pontifex

Maximus Scipio Nasica himself, they effectually defeated his purpose by putting him to a violent death[p]: a step which they had not ventured to take the day before*.

ii. *On the date of the death of* Attalus, *the last of the kings of Pergamus.*

As a corollary from the preceding conclusions the date of the death of Attalus the last of the kings of Pergamus admits of being probably determined also.

It appears that the will of this king, by which his dominions were bequeathed to the people of Rome, must have been brought to Rome precisely in the interval between the passing of the original motion or rogation of Tiberius Gracchus, in order to which it had been necessary to degrade his colleague Octavius, and this subsequent attempt at his own re-election[q]. He must therefore have died himself early in B. C. 133, (as Justin tells us[r], after an illness of seven days' duration only,) and his will must have been made known in Rome before the month of July the same year[s].

We may infer from these facts too that the original motion of Tiberius, out of which every thing else above considered ultimately arose, must have been both proposed and carried

* It is mentioned by Cicero, Oratio ix. In Verr. iv. 49, 108. that the Libri Sibyllini were consulted after the death of Tiberius Gracchus; and if so at this time, U. C. 621 B. C. 133: In quibus, he adds, inventum est Cererem antiquissimam placari oportere: which Ceres was understood to mean the Ceres of Enna in Sicily. Cf. also Valerius Max. i. i. 7 De Religione. This too is an argument that the death of Gracchus actually happened in the Roman month of Sextilis, and very near the beginning of the month. The case of the battle of Cannæ, and its date Sextilis 2, are demonstrative that the Sacrum Cereris in the Roman calendar was attached to the beginning of that month. Cf. supra, Diss. v. ch. i. sect. v. note: Vol. i. 445.

[p] Appian, B. C. i. 16. Livy, lviii. Plutarch, Vita, xix. xxi. Cicero, xix. In Catilinam i. 1, 3. Velleius Pat. ii. 3. Florus, iii. 14. § 7. Macrobius, Somnium Scip. i. 4. p. 16.

[q] Plutarch, Vita, xiv: xx. Appian, B. C. i. 13—17. Cf. Livy, lviii. Strabo, xiii. 4. Jerome, Chron. Ol. 162. 2.

[r] xxxvi. 4. § 1—5. Cf. Diodorus, Fragm. xxxiv.

[s] Cf. Velleius Pat. ii. 4: 38. Livy, lviii. Valerius Max. v. ii. 3 De Gratitudine, Externa. Florus, iii. 15. § 1, 2. Eutropius, iv. 9. Orosius, v. 8: 14. Auctor De Viris, Tiberius Gracchus. Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 53. p. 173 dates his death, or rather the sale of his effects, U. C. 622—or 56 years after the triumph of Scipio Asiaticus, U. C. 565: i. e. 56, exclusive of both extremes, U. C. 565 and U. C. 622.

early in the year; for Caius his brother had been appointed one of the commission of three who were to carry that motion into execution[t]: and, though he was absent at that time serving in the army before Numantia, yet it appears that he was present himself at Rome, at the time of the death of Tiberius[u]. There must consequently have been time enough even after the passing of the original motion and before the death of Tiberius to summon Caius to Rome from Numantia.

Scipio too was engaged in the siege of Numantia when he heard of the death of Tiberius[w]: and though he was appointed to the command in Spain in B. C. 134, and though Velleius Paterculus tells us[x] that he reduced Numantia Intra annum ac tres menses quam eo venerat; yet it is clear from Appian[y] that he did not invest the city nor sit down to the siege before it in form until after the winter of B. C. 134: that is until the spring of B. C. 133. The year and three months of Velleius therefore must be reckoned from the spring of B. C. 133: and that will give the reduction at last about midsummer, B. C. 132; followed in the course of the same year by Scipio's triumph De Numantia, 14 years after that De Carthagine, B. C. 146*.

We may conclude our observations on this year with one more remark. According to the rule of alternation which had been observed from B. C. 153 to B. C. 134 in general, it might have been expected that B. C. 133 would be intercalary. But the Pontifex Maximus at this time was no friend of Tiberius Gracchus; on the contrary, he must have been one of his most determined opponents: and as the latter, from

* Cicero, Oratio xlii, Pro Rege Dejotaro, 7, 19 alludes to certain presents sent from Asia by Attalus to Scipio Africanus, and received at Numantia by him in the presence of his army: which he describes as most magnificent. If these were actually received *at* Numantia, and when the siege was going on, it must have been in the spring quarter, B. C. 133; and early in that quarter too: and these presents could have been sent by Attalus only a little before his death.

[t] Plutarch, Tiberius, xiii. Appian, i. 13—18: 21.

[u] Plutarch, Tiberius, xx.

[w] Ibid. xxi. Livy, lix. Velleius Pat. ii. 4. Valerius Max. vi. ii. 3 De Libere Dictis. Cicero, De Oratore, ii. 25, 106. A. Gellius, ii. 13.

[x] ii. 4.

[y] vi. 89, 90. Cf. 84: 86—88.

the time of his entering on office, iv Idus Decembres U. C. 620 Dec. 9 B. C. 134, had already become obnoxious to the party to which the Pontifex Maximus belonged; it is no wonder that with a view to cut short his year of office as much as possible the intercalation, required by rule U.C. 621 B. C. 133, should have been purposely omitted in that year, and reserved for the next: in which, as our calendar shews, it must actually have taken place.

SECTION III.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 7.355 *days.*

U. C. 624 Varr. 623 Cap. 621 Polyb. B. C. 130.

C. Claudius Pulcher
M. Perperna.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 12 B. C. 130. Nundinal Char. 2.

Josephus has preserved a decree of the Roman senate, passed in the reign of John Hyrcanus, and dated viii Idus Februarias, February 6 Roman [z]. The year indeed to which it belongs is doubtful: but it seems to have been either B. C. 130 or B. C. 129.

There would be nothing to remark concerning this date in either of those years, except that it could not have fallen on the seventh day of the Hebdomadal cycle, neither B. C. 130 nor B. C. 129. February 6 Roman U. C. 624 corresponded to February 15 Julian B. C. 130; and U. C. 625 to February 5 B. C. 129. The former was a Wednesday; the latter a Monday. In a case when the Jews and their scruples were concerned; this is a distinction which requires to be taken into account. The senate which passed the decree was held in the comitium; and that is some argument that it was probably not passed on a Nundinal day, when the comitium would have been occupied by the Nundinal resort [a]. A Fannius was prætor (urbanus) at the time; described in the decree as the son of Marcus. There were two Fanniuses, each of whom had the prænomen of Caius. C. Fannius the son of Marcus appears to have been the historian [b], the son-

[z] Ant. Jud. xiii. ix. 2.
[a] Cf. Diss. vii. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. ii. 47.
[b] Cicero, De Claris Oratt. ad Brutum, 20, 81: 26, 99—101: De Oratore, ii. 67, 270: Tusculanæ, iv. 17, 40. Velleius Pat. ii. 9.

in-law of Lælius[c] and the contemporary and friend of Tiberius Gracchus[d] *.

SECTION IV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 8. 378 *days.*

U. C. 625 Varr. 624 Cap. 622 Polyb. B. C. 129.

C. Sempronius Tuditanus
Man. Aquillius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 2 B. C. 129. Nundinal Char. 7.

i. *Date of Cicero's Dialogue* De Republica.

This year is the assumed date of Cicero's dialogue De Republica; great part of which has been recovered in our time by the Cardinal Angelo Maio.

The dialogue itself is supposed to have been held at the Feriæ Latinæ of the year[e]; yet in the winter season[f]: from which it follows that, if Cicero paid a due regard to historical truth and propriety in the circumstances of these imaginary conversations of his, and was not (like Plato his model and prototype in that class of his compositions) deliberately careless of history and chronology, the Feriæ Latinæ of this year were known to have fallen out in the winter.

The Kalends of January U. C. 625 Jan. 2 B. C. 129 certainly fell in the winter. The Feriæ Latinæ had no fixed date[g]. They might fall early in a given year, and they might fall late. It is allowable to assume that this year they probably fell some time in the Roman February before the Terminalia, February 23 Roman, February 22 Julian; and that might be considered to have been still in the winter.

* As this Fannius was the son of Marcus, it might be conjectured that he was the Fannius named in the decree. But Cicero, De Republica, Lib. i. mentions this C. Fannius and Q. Scævola, (both sons-in-law of Lælius,) as present at that dialogue, the time of which was U. C. 625 B. C. 129; and he describes them as then of the quæstorian age: Jam ætate quæstorios. If so Fannius could not have been prætor either U. C. 624 B. C. 130 or U. C. 625 B. C. 129.

[c] Cicero, De Amicitia, i. 3, 5. Brutus, 26, 101.

[d] Plutarch, Tiberius, iv. Appian, vi. 67. Hispanica. Cf. the Fasti Consulares, U. C. 632 B. C. 122.

[e] Lib. i.

[f] Ibid.

[g] See supra, p. 15.

This year is remarkable also as being that of the death of Scipio Africanus the younger, not without the suspicion of violence; though there is nothing on record which would prove that any such suspicion was well founded, or that though his death was sudden and unexpected it was not after all a natural death. If he was in his 56th year at the time[h], and yet was born B. C. 184, his birthday must have fallen early in the year; for his death appears to have happened early in the course of this year too: and not long after the supposed date of Cicero's dialogue, in which he sustains the principal part[i].

The date of a triumph celebrated this year, (that of the consul Sempronius De Iapudibus,) is extant also; Kalendis Octobribus[k]. The expedition before this was undertaken in the midst of those proceedings at Rome which were still going on when Scipio was found dead in his bed[l]: and that too is one among other arguments that he must have died early in the course of the year.

SECTION V.—*On the general administration of the Calendar from* U. C. 601 B. C. 153 *to* U. C. 625 B. C. 129.

We may further observe on this year, U. C. 625 B. C. 129, that it stands at the distance of 24 years complete (one cycle of the regular calendar) from U. C. 601 B. C. 153. In these 24 years also there was the same number of common and the same of intercalary years, as there would have been in one regular cycle; 13 of the former, 11 of the latter. The first of these 24 years too was intercalary, as the first year of the regular Decemviral cycle must have been. As however nine of these intercalary months consisted of 23 days, and two only of 22 days; five days more were thereby introduced into the calendar in the course of these 24 years than otherwise would have been the case: and consequently the Kalends of January at the beginning of the 25th year, U. C. 625, were *five* days, (but not more than five,) in advance of the Kalends

[h] See supra, 210, note.

[i] Cf. De Republica, Lib. i: De Natura Deorum, ii. 5, 14. Livy, lix. Velleius Pat. ii. 4. Appian, B. C. i. 19, 20. Orosius, v. 10.

[k] Vol. ii. 88. No. lxxxvii.

[l] Appian, B. C. i. 19. Livy, lix.

of January in the first year, U.C. 601; Jan. 2 B. C. 129, instead of Dec. 28 B. C. 130.

In these coincidences it is impossible not to perceive a studied conformity of the administration of the calendar through these 24 years at least to the old and proper rule of the same kind in the most regular times. It adds to the significancy of the coincidence that the first of these years, B. C. 154–153, was the probable date of the decease of one Pontifex Maximus, M. Æmilius Lepidus, and of the election of another [m], P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, grandson of Scipio Nasica, the Hospes of the Mater Idæa B. C. 204, (publicly recognized on that occasion as the vir optimus of his time): the same who appears in the consular Fasti as the colleague of Decimus Junius Brutus Callaïcus U.C. 616 B. C. 138; and whom one of the tribunes of his day is said to have nicknamed Serapio [n], from his likeness to a person of low condition (a slave) at Rome of that name.

According to Velleius Paterculus [o] he was created Pontifex Maximus in his absence from Rome; which, if true, would imply that those with whom the election rested (whether the people in general or the college of Pontiffs in particular) must have had an high opinion of his fitness for the office: and Cicero appears to confirm this, by speaking of him, as often as he has occasion to mention him [m], as one of the most able and eminent who ever presided over the college of Pontiffs. History has recorded nothing which can be set in opposition to this favourable construction of his character, or which has left a blot upon his name, except the part which he took against Tiberius Gracchus: and though to our own dispassionate judgment, and to our better and clearer apprehensions of right and wrong, his conduct on that occasion cannot but appear culpable; it is but just that we should make every allowance for the passions and prejudices of the time, and for the very different feelings and convictions which determined the line of conduct in difficult and critical cases, like these, among the Romans of old. This act

m See supra, p. 3c.

n Cf. Livy, lv. Cicero, De Legg. iii. 9, 20. Valerius Max. ix. xiv. 3 De Similitudine Formæ. Pliny, H. N. vii. 10. p. 68.

o ii. 3. Cf. Livy, xxix. 14: xxxvi. 40. Diodorus, Frag. xxxiv.

of the supreme Pontiff did not pass away without any personal ill-consequences to himself. It was so deeply resented by the people of Rome, and so soon too, that, though not actually banished by a public decree, he thought it expedient to go into voluntary exile [q] under pretence of an honorary mission to Asia; and apparently the very same year. Nor did he return to Rome; but died himself not long after at Pergamus [q].

Licinius Crassus the next Pontifex Maximus was certainly already in office in his consular year, U.C. 623 B.C. 131; in which he was despatched to Asia against Aristonicus, and in the course of which year or of the next he came by his death there: having been the first Pontifex Maximus, according to the Epitome of Livy [r], who left Italy to go beyond seas in such a command as his. He was probably appointed B. C. 133; or early B. C. 132. Nasica's superintendence of the calendar consequently could not have lasted for the whole of these 24 years; but it did so for 20 or 21 of the number. And we may consider it extremely probable that, whether in pursuance of a plan first laid down by his predecessor Æmilius, and steadily acted upon for fourteen or fifteen years before his death, or in consequence of some resolution of his own; as the Kalends of January U. C. 601 B. C. 153 had been brought *de facto* as nearly as possible to par with their old and proper date, December 29, Nasica and the college proposed for the future, and as far as circumstances would permit, to keep them confined to that date: and not to let them fall lower than December 28; nor yet to rise higher than January 26 (one *mensis cavus*). And if our own arrangements for these 24 years may be taken as any criterion of the true, it is clear that they succeeded in this object; and by the simplest of all expedients, a judicious alternation of common and intercalary years: yet without any danger of incurring the Nundinal Incidence on the Kalends of January.

The experience of these 24 years having thus demonstrated what was capable of being done in this way; we shall see the same principles kept in view, and the same management of the details of the calendar exemplified in its administration, and with nearly the same results, for the next 24 years

[q] Plutarch, Tiberius Gracchus, xxi. Cf. supra, p. 30. [r] lix.

also, from U. C. 625. B. C. 129 to U. C. 649 B. C. 105: though the Kalends of January at the latter of these epochs were 17 days in defect of the *date* from which they set out at the former. The times after B. C. 105 U. C. 649 were times of great public danger or disorder: nor is it surprising that the administration of the calendar, from that time forward, should begin to exhibit symptoms of sympathising with the unsettled state of public affairs; and should no longer appear to be governed by the same fixed and definite principles which had regulated it more or less uniformly for 48 years before.

SECTION VI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 11. 355 *days.*

U. C. 628 Varr. 627 Cap. 625 Polyb. B. C. 126.

M. Æmilius Lepidus
L. Aurelius Orestes.

Kalendæ Januariæ January 17 B. C. 126. Nundinal Char. 8.

The date of a triumph this year is extant, that of M'. Aquillius Pro. Cos. Ex Asia[s]; i. e. over Aristonicus, the late competitor with the people of Rome for the inheritance of Attalus, the last of the kings of Pergamus. There is nothing particular to remark upon it, except that as Ex Asia it might have been expected to fall late in the year; as in fact it appears to have done, iii Idus Novembres U. C. 628, November 20 B. C. 126.

SECTION VII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 16. 355 *days.*

U. C. 633. Varr. 632. Cap. 630. Polyb. B. C. 122–121.

Q. Fabius Maximus (Allobrogicus)
L. Opimius.

Kalendæ Januariæ December 20 B. C. 122. Nundinal Char. 2.

A date has been recorded of this year, which is calculated to illustrate both the Roman calendar of the time being, and one of the calendars of the north of Europe, the ancient Gallic calendar. It is the date of the victory of Q. Fabius Maximus, consul of this year, over the Arverni or Allobroges,

[s] Cf. Vol. ii. 89. No. lxxviii.

which earned him his surname of Allobrogicus; vii or vi Idus Augustas or Sextiles U. C. 633, Sextilis 7 or 8 Roman[t]. It may be shewn that this Roman date and the Luna sexta of the Gallic calendar, Period ii. 84 Cycle xi. 4, met together in the 21st or 22d of July B. C. 121: and this coincidence we consider sufficient to authenticate both these calendars for this particular year.

SECTION VIII.—*Remarks on the administration of the Calendar from* B. C. 124—121.

Here however it is proper to observe that the arrangements which we have adopted in this part of the fourth irregular cycle suppose four years in sequence U. C. 630 to 633, B. C. 124–121, without any intercalation; contrary to the rule which is seen to have been prevailing both before and after. But there is in reality no difficulty in this circumstance. The first of these years, U. C. 630 B. C. 124, as next in order to a year which *was* intercalary might be common of course. And on the iv Idus Decembres this year, the usual Tribunician Ingress, December 20 B. C. 124, Caius Gracchus having been elected Tribunus Plebis for the first time entered upon office; and with office on the same career of agitation in which his brother Tiberius had preceded him nine years before: and in which he persisted until his death. He was continued in the tribuneship for the *third* year iv Idus Decembres U. C. 632, November 30 B. C. 122; and came to the same kind of untimely end as his brother, some time after the ingress of the next consular year, the Kalends of January U. C. 633, December 20 B. C. 122[u]. It is to be presumed that they who had the care of the calendar at this time, belonging as no doubt they did to the party opposed to Caius, and which Cicero calls that of the *optimates*, would make a point of shortening the official term of each of the years during which the obnoxious Tribune was agitating his various questions. We might have expected therefore *a*

[t] Pliny, H. N. vii. 51. 228. Livy, lxi.

[u] Plutarch, Caius Gr. iii–vii.: viii–xii: xiii–xviii. Livy, lx: lxi. Appian, B. C. i. 21–26. Velleius Pat. ii. 6: 7. Pliny, H. N. xiv. 6: 48. Cicero, Orat. xix. In Cat. i. 2, 4. Brutus, 28, 109. De Finibus, iv. 24, 66. Sallust, Bell. Jug. xix: xlvi. Dionysius Hal. ii. 11. Obsequens, xci: xciii. Valerius Max. vi. viii. 3 De fide Servorum. Diodorus, Fragm. xxxiv. Dio, Frag. xc. Orosius, v. 12. Florus, iii. 15. Auctor De Viris, Caius Gracchus.

priori to find that they were all common years; as in fact, *a posteriori*, it is absolutely necessary to suppose that they must all have been.

SECTION IX.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* iv. 23. 378 days.

U. C. 640 Varr. 639 Cap. 637 Polyb. B. C. 115–114.

M'. Acilius Balbus
C. Porcius Cato.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 17 B. C. 115. Nundinal Char. 8.

i. *On the date of the incest of the Vestal Virgins,* U. C. 639 B. C. 115.

This year is memorable in the contemporary history for the discovery of the crime of incest among the virgins of Vesta; which had been going on too, on a scale of magnitude never before exampled, undetected and with impunity for some time[w]: and led eventually to the condemnation of three of their number at least, (i. e. half the entire body at once,) Æmilia, Licinia, and Marcia; each of them related to the noblest or most illustrious families in Rome.

We collect from the testimony of Obsequens on this point[x], (virtually confirmed by that of Plutarch and Orosius[y],) that this discovery must have been made later in the year than the date of the Ludi Romani at least; i. e. September 4—12 Roman U. C. 640 September 6—14 B. C. 114. We learn in like manner from the testimony of Macrobius the very time at which the inquiry into it was actually going on, and when each of the accused virgins was put upon her trial. He is treating of the date of the Saturnalia, and of the number of days for which they were kept in former times; in illustration of both which points he quotes various authorities, and among others Masurius, (author of one work De Fastis[z] and of another entitled Memorialia[a],) and Fenestella.

[w] Livy, lxiii. Dio, Fragm. xci: xcii. Orosius, v. 15.

[x] xcvii.

[y] Quæstiones Romanæ, lxxxiii. Cf. Orosius, v. 15.

[z] Saturnalia, i. 4. 211. 213.

[a] Ibid. iii. 6. 18. Of this Masurius or Massurius (Sabinus), (often quoted by Macrobius), see also A. Gellius, iv. 9: 20: v. 6: 13: 19: vi. 7: x. 15: xi. 18: xiv. 2.

Masurius et alii uno die, id est quartodecimo Kalendas Januarias, fuisse Saturnalia crediderunt: quorum sententiam Fenestella confirmat, dicens Æmiliam virginem quintodecimo Kalendarum Januariarum (Dec. 16 Roman) esse damnatam; quo die si Saturnalia gererentur nec caussam omnino dixisset: deinde adjicit; Sequebantur eam diem Saturnalia: mox ait; Postero autem die, qui fuit tertius decimus Kalendarum Januariarum (Dec. 18 Roman) Liciniam virginem ut caussam diceret jussam [b].

It appears however from Asconius [c] that a double inquiry was instituted into the charge brought against these virgins; the first before L. Metellus the Pontifex Maximus, to whose jurisdiction the inquiry properly belonged: and this terminated in the condemnation of Æmilia and in the absolution of Licinia and Marcia. The second was instituted by L. Cassius, a judge of noted severity; appointed *extra ordinem*, at the motion of Sex. Peduceus, one of the tribunes of the people, who found fault with the lenity of the Pontifex Maximus: in order that a strict examination into all the facts of the case might be set on foot. And this having been done accordingly, it ended according to Asconius in the condemnation not only of those other two virgins but also of many more. The first inquiry then must have been instituted later than the ingress of the tribunician year, Dec. 10 Roman U. C. 640, Dec. 10 Julian B. C. 114. The dates above recorded confirm this conclusion: that of the condemnation of Æmilia Dec. 16 Roman and Julian, and that of the absolution of Licinia and Marcia, Dec. 18, and that of the Saturnalia, Dec. 17, between the two. Neither of these days too Dec. 16 or 18 U. C. 640 was Nundinal.

An Ædes to Venus Verticordia or Turner of Hearts, as we learnt from Ovid [d], was vowed in consequence of these violations of the obligation of chastity, so incumbent on the virgins of Vesta; and this was erected accordingly, and dedicated on the Kalends of April: more probably U. C. 642 April 8 B. C. 112, than U. C. 641 March 27 B. C. 113: though neither of these days too was Nundinal. We learn also from Plutarch [e]

[b] Saturnalia, i. 10. 240. Cf. Cicero, Brutus, 43, 160.

[c] In Oration. Pro Milone, p. 152, 153.

[d] Vol. ii. 108. No. xxix.

[e] Quæstiones Romanæ, lxxxiii.

that, as another consequence of these recent occurrences, and in obedience to the same direction of the Sibylline books which had prescribed the erection of the Ædes in question, the peculiar ceremony of the sacrifice of a Græcus and a Græca, a Gallus and a Galla, by inhumation or burying alive, was repeated some time on the same occasion. And as it seems that this ceremony had a stated day, determined by the first case of the kind[f], v Kalendas Decembres, Nov. 26 Roman, we may presume that such was its date in the present instance. And if so, Nov. 26 Roman U. C. 641 Nov. 16 B. C. 113. Neither was that a Nundinal day.

CHAPTER II.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 1. 377 days.

U. C. 642 Varr. 641 Cap. 639 Polyb. B. C. 113—112.

M. Livius Drusus
L. Calpurnius Piso Cæsoninus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 19 B. C. 113. Nundinal Char. 3.

i. *On the date of the siege of* Cirta, *and of the death of* Atherbal *or* Adherbal, *in the Numidian Calendar,* B. C. 112.

This year precedes the first of the Bellum Jugurthinum: which broke out the next year, U. C. 643 B. C. 112—111. The events of this year however are calculated to illustrate not only the Roman calendar of the time, but also the Numidian; which at this time was absolutely the same with the Primitive. For this reason we shall begin the illustration of

[f] Vol. ii. 115. No. iii.

the present cycle with considering these events, and their chronological characters.

It appears from Sallust[g] that the battle between Atherbal and Jugurtha under the walls of Cirta, followed by the beginning of the siege laid to that city by Jugurtha, was fought at the end of some lunar month. The armies met the evening before, too late to give battle to each other the same day; and the next morning, or rather just before day-break the same night, Obscuro etiam tum lumine[g], Jugurtha surprised the encampment of Atherbal: and this success was followed immediately by the siege of Cirta.

This siege so begun had been going on *five* months when Atherbal sent word to Rome of the situation in which he was placed[h]: Itaque *quinctum* jam mensem socius populi Romani armis obsessus teneor[i]; and the Roman legati, whom the receipt of this news induced the senate to send to Africa, are represented to have used such despatch that they put to sea only three days after the arrival of his letters[k]; and soon after landed at Utica: from whence they sent notice of their coming and of the commands of the senate to Jugurtha under the walls of Cirta.

The arrival of these legates however produced no effect but that of a visit from Jugurtha himself; who affected so much deference to the will of the senate as to come In Provinciam[l] in person to receive its deputies. But the siege of Cirta was not relaxed all that time: and no sooner had the deputies departed home again, and Atherbal, soon after, had been persuaded to give up himself and the city to Jugurtha, on certain conditions, than, without any regard to the engagement just made, he immediately put him to death[m].

There are two criterions of the time when, after this, the news of this fresh outrage was probably received at Rome; one, that C. Memmius was already tribunus plebis designatus[n]; i. e. the tribunician comitia of the year by that time were over: the other, that the consuls had yet to be elected; Lege Sempronia provinciæ *futuris* consulibus Numidia atque Italia decretæ. And the new consuls were actually elected

[g] Bell. Jug. xxiv. [h] Ibid. xxv. [m] Bell. Jug. xxviii. Livy, lxiv.
[i] Ibid. xxvi. [k] Ibid. xxvii. [n] Bell. Jug. xxix.
[l] Ibid. xxvii. Cf. Florus, iii. 1. § 7.

after this; Consules declarati P. Scipio Nasica L. Bestia Calpurnius[o]: who represent U. C. 643, the first year of the Jugurthine war, B. C. 111.

Now, if we may assume that the comitia of both kinds were regular this year, (to which no objection is discoverable in the contemporary accounts,) the tribunician would probably be held in Sextilis, between August 6 and Sept. 4; and the consular in November Roman, between Nov. 3 and Dec. 2. With respect then to the interval between these last comitia and the reduction of Cirta followed by the death of Atherbal; if the letters of Atherbal which announced the fact of his being besieged were written in the *fifth* month of the siege, they would be received at Rome in the sixth: and this second piece of news, from the scene of the contest, would probably be received two months afterwards; eight months from the commencement of the siege. If then this last piece of news was actually received in October, B. C. 112, the siege must have been begun in February or March, the same year, before.

Now the primitive Thoth, Æra Cyc. 3895 was falling Sept. 25 at midnight B. C. 113: and therefore the primitive Mecheir Feb. 22 at midnight B. C. 112. February 20 this year, as our General Lunar Calendar shews, was the date of the new moon of February: and so far February 22 the first of the primitive or Numidian Mecheir, the same year, the luna tertia of that moon, would be altogether suitable to the day when, (the armies of Atherbal and Jugurtha having come into the presence of each other the night before,) the camp of the former was surprised by Jugurtha the next morning.

Let us suppose then that the siege of Cirta began on or about the 22d of February, B. C. 112; on or about the first of the Numidian Mecheir. The fifth month of the siege on this principle would be the Numidian Paüni, June 22—July 22. And the sixth month would be the Numidian Epiphi, July 22 to August 21. Atherbal's letters, announcing his situation, we may very well suppose might be received at Rome in the first half of that sixth month; between July 20 and August 6. Consequently the mission of Scaurus and

[o] Cf. Livy, lxiv. Obsequens, xciv. Eutropius, iv. 11. Orosius, v. 15.

his colleagues, which ensued immediately upon it, and their return home, after the transaction of their business in Africa, might both be over before the autumnal equinox September 26, and the first of the Numidian Thoth September 25. By the same time too it is probable that Cirta and Atherbal had both fallen into the power of Jugurtha; in which case the news of the death of Atherbal would be received at Rome some time in the course of the Numidian Thoth, Sept. 25 and October 25; when the comitia tribunicia of the year in all probability were over, and the consular, though not yet actually held, were close at hand *.

This conclusion is confirmed to a certain extent by what Sallust next relates; viz. that Jugurtha himself, having heard of the resolution to go to war with him which had been come to at Rome, and of the assignation of Numidia to one of the consuls as his province for the year, sent an embassy to

* From various other passages of Sallust indeed it appears that there had been embassies to and from Rome and Africa respectively, before the point of time at which our review of the chronology of the year began; viz. the month of February B. C. 112.

Atherbal had sent legati to Rome before he was surprised at Cirta[1]: and an embassy both from him and from Jugurtha was at Rome some time even before that[2]: and Roman deputies had been appointed on that occasion to mediate between them. Atherbal's embassy[1] prior to the siege was sent to complain of Jugurtha's infraction of the conditions prescribed by these deputies: and one motive, which made Jugurtha the more anxious to press the siege of Cirta, was to anticipate, if possible, the return of this embassy from Rome[1].

The senate sent three fresh deputies in consequence of this complaint[1]. And these had heard of the battle under the walls of Cirta, before they set out from Rome; but only, as Sallust observes, in the shape of a faint report: Sed is rumor clemens erat[3]. We have supposed the battle to have been fought on Feb. 22; and these deputies might be setting out at the end of March or the beginning of April. They returned without seeing Atherbal: though they delivered their message to Jugurtha; and were put off by him with a promise that he would send an embassy to Rome and explain his conduct. As soon as they were gone he renewed the siege more vigorously than ever: and this it was which occasioned the letters of Atherbal[4], in which he complained Se quinctum jam mensem obsessum teneri.

1 Cap. xxiv.
2 xiii—xix: xxiii. This was in consequence of the death of Hiempsal. Livy, Epit. lxii. lxiii. dates that U. C. 639 B. C. 115.
3 xxv.
4 xxv. xxvi.

Rome[p]. When these ambassadors arrived Bestia was already in office[p]. They did not therefore arrive before the Kalends of January U. C. 643 Dec. 31 B. C. 112; and they were ordered to leave Italy in *ten* days' time—their departure being speedily followed by that of the consul also to Africa: which makes it morally certain that they must have been sent in the spring of B. C. 111; and probably in March or April. It is clear then that Jugurtha could not have heard of the war's being decreed against him in time to send an embassy until after the winter of B. C. 112; and that would be explained, if the receipt of the news of his last outrage at Cirta, the election of consuls after it, the assignation of provinces, and the other preliminary proceedings, all took place at Rome at the end of October, or the beginning of November.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 4. 378 *days.*

U. C. 645 Varr. 644 Cap. 642 Polyb. B. C. 110–109.

Q. Cæcilius Metellus (Numidicus)
M. Junius Silanus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 11 B. C. 110. Nundinal Char. 4.

i. *Chronology of the third year of the* Bellum Jugurthinum.

We pass over the first year of the war[q], B. C. 111. The consuls of the second year, U. C. 644 B. C. 111—110, Sp. (Postumius) Albinus Q. (M.) Minucius Rufus are mentioned in their proper order of time; and Jugurtha himself was at Rome at the ingress of their year[r], Dec. 21 B. C. 111; having been brought thither by the prætor L. Cassius[s]; who had been deputed to Africa on purpose by a motion of the tribune C. Memmius[t], between the return of the consul Bestia to the comitia[u] and the end of the official year. And this was possible; if the consul returned against the Roman October, September 23, and the year did not expire until December 20. Jugurtha's return to Africa on this occasion,

[p] Bell. Jug. xxx. Cf. Florus, iii. 1. § 7.
[q] Sallust, Bell. Jug. xxx. xxxi. xxxii—xxxviii.
[r] Ibid. xxxix. Livy, lxiv. Florus, iii 1. § 8. Orosius, v. 15. Eutropius, iv. 11.
[s] Bell. Jug. xxxvii. xxxviii.
[t] Ibid. xxxii—xxxvi.
[u] Ibid. xxxi. xxxii.

like that of his ambassadors on the former one, was followed by the departure of the consul Albinus[w] to his province, Numidia: so that neither, we may presume, was earlier than the spring quarter, B. C. 110. The consul's departure at least must have been late in the spring; for the comitia of the year were almost at hand[x] even when he was only setting out.

It appears however that the comitia of every kind in this present year were thrown out of their usual course by the disputes which arose, probably soon after this departure of the consul, among the Tribuni plebis; two of whom, P. Lucullus and L. Annius, were intriguing to continue themselves in office for another year[y]: which the rest of the body would not permit. Quæ dissensio, observes Sallust, totius anni comitia impediebat. It was consequently late in the year when Albinus returned to preside at the consular election; and his army had been previously disposed of in winter quarters, under his brother, A. Postumius, one of his legates in Africa.

The prolonged absence of the consul, produced by the continuance of these dissensions at home, encouraged this legate, Aulus Postumius, to attempt a decisive stroke, in the hope both of terminating the war and of gratifying his own cupidity, by the surprise of the stronghold of Suthul, where Jugurtha's treasures were known to have been laid up. And this attempt, as it clearly appears from the testimony of Sallust, was made in the Roman January. Milites mense Januario ex hibernis in expeditionem evocat: and in the depth of winter also: Magnisque itineribus *hieme aspera* pervenit ad oppidum Suthul, ubi regis thesauri erant[y]. And the failure of the enterprize at last is attributed as much to the inclemency of the season, and to the additional impediments thereby occasioned, as to the natural strength of the place, or to the incompetency of the Roman general: Quod quamquam et sævitia temporis et obportunitate loci neque capi neque obsideri poterat, (nam circum murum situm in prærupti montis extremo planicies limosa hiemalibus aquis paludem fecerat,) tamen aut simulandi gratia quo regi formidinem adderet, aut cupidine cæcus ob thesauros oppidi poti-

[w] Bell. Jug. xxxix. xl. [x] Ibid. xl. xli. [y] Ibid. xli.

undi, vineas agere aggerem jacere aliaque quæ incepto usui forent properare[z].

We have then in this account a plain intimation that the Roman January this year was coinciding either wholly or in part with the depth of winter; and our calendar will shew that such was actually the case. The Kalends of January U. C. 645 fell on December 11 B. C. 110; and the Kalends of February on Jan. 9 B. C. 109. The latter half of the month consequently must have coincided with the depth of winter: and to judge from the sequel of the account of the expedition it must have been undertaken in the latter half of the month in question.

There was certainly some interval of time between the arrival of Aulus before Suthul and the surprise of his camp by Jugurtha[a]; previously to which surprise too he had contrived to draw him off from Suthul as if in pursuit of himself. But it appears that this surprise was effected at last *intempesta nocte*[a], which means at midnight or after it; and when the rest of the night was dark all through: Cœlum nocte atque nubibus obscuratum[a]. Now there was a full moon January 3 B. C. 109; and a new moon January 18: and this moon would be seven or eight days old, and setting about midnight, on January 25. The time purposely chosen by Jugurtha for his attack on the Roman camp appears to have been *this*, when there was moonlight until midnight and darkness for the remainder of the night.

The site of Suthul indeed is not known: nor is the quarter specified from which the Roman commander began his march upon it. It must however have been somewhere within the limits of the Provincia. Now one of the conditions imposed on him by Jugurtha was *this*, Uti diebus decem Numidia decederet[b]; and this was done accordingly: for even after the return of the consul Albinus we find it observed, Nam omnis exercitus uti convenerat Numidia deductus in Provincia hiemabat[c]. We may infer then that Suthul could not have been less than ten days' march from the Roman head quarters in the Provincia. Consequently it must have re-

[z] Cap. xli. Cf. Livy, lxiv. Florus, iii. 189. Orosius, v. 15: calls this place, which A. Postumius thus endeavoured to surprise, not Suthul, but Calama.

[a] Cap. xlii. [b] xlii. [c] xliii.

quired ten days at least to march to Suthul, and ten days at least to march back again: and we may allow fifteen days more for the proceedings between the arrival at Suthul and this convention made with Jugurtha. On this principle A. Albinus must have come before Suthul about Jan. 10; and consequently have set out to march thither not later than Dec. 30 or 31: which would be on the 20th or 21st of the Roman January, and strictly in the severest part of the winter. Even after the news of his disgrace and of the terms which he had been compelled to accept from Jugurtha had been received at Rome, and even after the return of the consul to resume the command, produced by this intelligence; the army is supposed to be still wintering in the Provincia[c]: and yet it is not probable that the consul could have been able to return before March or April.

We may therefore consider our calendar, from B. C. 112–109, to have been sufficiently verified by the testimony of Sallust De Bello Jugurthino. It would be in our power to illustrate it by means of the same testimony for another year, B. C. 108, the fourth year of the war: but, as this year in particular is as much calculated to confirm the Numidian calendar for the time being as our Roman calendar, we purposely reserve it for a future opportunity.

SECTION III.—*On the administration of the Calendar from U. C.* 642 *to U. C.* 653 *B. C.* 112 *to* 101 *in general.*

The second and third years of this fifth cycle, B. C. 111 and B. C. 110, are both years of 355 days. The former would be so *secundum ordinem*; as following on an intercalary year, B. C. 112. The latter might be purposely made common because of the factious proceedings of the tribunes of the people, then going on; which were no doubt as obnoxious to the pontifical college as to the rest of the aristocratical party at Rome.

For the same reason, the next year U. C. 645, the consular year of Q. Cæcilius Metellus, surnamed Numidicus for his conduct in the war with Jugurtha, and appointed this year to the command in Numidia, was very likely to be made intercalary in order to lengthen the term of his year of office;

[c] xliii.

either out of personal favour to himself as he was nearly related to the Pontifex Maximus, or simply because of the obstruction of the elections at the usual time the year before, and the consequent retardation of the official ingress. For it does not appear that those impediments to it were over even in the month of January Roman U. C. 645. Albinus is termed consul by Sallust[d] after his return to Africa, though so much later than the expedition to Suthul: and even the actual consuls of U. C. 645 B. C. 109, Metellus and Silanus, are spoken of as still only *designati* when the recent disgrace of the Roman arms and the ignominious treaty concluded with Jugurtha were now both known of at Rome[e]. It is probable that it was the news of this unexpected reverse, and the alarm occasioned thereby, which caused the preexisting disputes to be suspended, in order that the magistrates of the year might be at last elected. In any case, there is every reason to conclude that the year of Metellus and Silanus could not have entered on the Kalends of January U. C. 645. At what distance from that day it actually entered we cannot undertake to say. A Merkedonius however, U. C. 645, even extra ordinem, to add to the official duration of a year which had already been so much curtailed at the beginning, would have been nothing remarkable. To favour Metellus indeed not only his consular year U. C. 645 B. C. 109 but his proconsular also U. C. 646 B. C. 108 might purposely be rendered intercalary. Besides which the Kalends of January U. C. 645 having fallen back to Dec. 11 B. C. 110, it was time to raise them again; and that could be done only by two intercalations B. C. 109 and 108: the effect of which, as our Tables shew, was to bring them up to Jan. 5 B. C. 107, the date of the Kalends of January U. C. 647; only three days higher than their date U. C. 625 Jan. 2 B. C. 129.

If after this we have three common years in succession, U. C. 647, 648, 649, B. C. 107–105, it should be considered that the first, U. C. 647, was the first consular year of Marius, a *novus homo*, personally obnoxious to the whole order of the *Optimates* or nobility, and especially to the family of the Metelli; as he was at this very time attempting to supersede Metellus in the command in Africa, and was coming

[d] xliii. [e] xlvii.

into notice and favour with the people of Rome only by decrying and disparaging him. *This* year notwithstanding might very well be common *secundum ordinem.*

We suspect however that U. C. 647 B. C. 107 was the year in which the Pontifex Maximus L. Metellus most probably died; and that after this year the administration of the calendar passed into other hands. Q. Servilius Cæpio[f] must have come between Metellus and Domitius Ahenobarbus[f]. The administration of Cæpio must have been short, and to himself full of misfortune; if it be true, as we find it on record concerning him in Valerius Maximus[f], that he died in prison B. C. 95 or 94, and did not meet even with the rites of burial. But on this point Valerius is contradicted by other testimony; which seems to leave no doubt that he was mistaken. It is no wonder however in any case, that under the superintendance of this Pontiff the rule of the calendar, as before regularly observed, should be seen to have fallen into abeyance.

The years which follow, U. C. 650 to 653 B. C. 104–101, are all intercalary. Nor could any of those intercalations at this period of the administration be dispensed with. Yet they might all be explained by the fact of their coinciding with the four successive consular years of Marius next after his first; of the alarm and apprehension excited at this period in general by the inroad of the Cimbri and Teutones; and of the necessity under which the republic was placed at such a crisis of availing itself of the services of a man like Marius to command its armies against these invaders. These considerations are sufficient to explain why four years, at this juncture of time, were purposely made as long as was possible; even though two of them, U. C. 652 and 653, B. C. 102 and 101, coincided also with the beginning and the continuance of the proceedings of the factious Tribune and demagogue L. Apuleius.

The second 24 years of the irregular calendar, dated from U. C. 601 B. C. 153 would expire U. C. 649 B. C. 105; and at that time the Kalends of January had fallen back to December 16, twelve days lower than December 28 B. C. 154, their date U. C. 601, and seventeen

[f] Supra, p. 31.

days lower than January 2 B. C. 129, their date U. C. 625. The intercalations in question contributed to rectify this anomaly, by raising them to January 12 B. C. 101, U. C. 653; nearly the same as their date U. C. 629 January 7 B. C. 125, 24 years before.

If after this year of the city (653) B. C. 101 traces of irregularity in the administration of the calendar, much greater than ever before since U. C. 601 B. C. 153, begin to be perceptible; it must be attributed to the increasing troublousness of the times, to the contests of parties, to the agitation and turbulence of strife and faction, which from thence forward began to prevail at Rome, and to throw every thing into confusion. But whatsoever might have been the cause of any inconsistency, any anomaly, of this kind; we are concerned ourselves only with the *fact* thereof. We must not collect our ideas of the actual administration of the calendar, either at these points of time or at any before them, from preconceived opinions of our own, or from any expectations *a priori*; but solely from testimony, from the necessity of the case, and from the matter of fact. It is enough for our purpose if testimony is at hand, as often as we have occasion for it, to confirm our arrangements, by shewing their agreement with the matter of fact; whether the reasons of the fact itself can always be discovered or not.

SECTION IV.—i. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 8. 355 *days.*

U. C. 649 Varr. 648 Cap. 646 Polyb. B. C. 106–105.

P. Rutilius Rufus
Cn. Mallius Maximus.

Kalendæ Januariæ December 16 B. C. 106. Nundinal Char. 2.

ii. *Irregular Calendar. Cycle* v. 12. 378 *days.*

U. C. 653 Varr. 652 Cap. 650 Polyb. B. C. 101.

C. Marius v
M'. Aquillius.

Kalendæ Januariæ January 12 B. C. 101. Nundinal Char. 2.

Date of the defeat of Cæpio *by the* Cimbri U. C. 649; *and of the victory of* Marius *over the* Cimbri U. C. 653.

Each of these years supplies a remarkable proof of the truth of our Roman calendar for the time being; and not the less so because the same proof authenticates a totally distinct calendar also, (of which we may possibly give a more particular account hereafter,) the Cimbric, Teutonic, or Allemannic.

The Roman date of the defeat of Cæpio by the Cimbri and Teutones was Pridie Nonas Octobres, U. C. 649[g]; September 12 B. C. 105. The Roman date of the last and decisive victory of Marius over these same invaders was iii Kalendas Sextiles U. C. 653[h]; August 28 B. C. 101. It is in our power to shew that each of these dates coincided with the full moon; the former with the full moon of September B. C. 105, the latter with that of August B. C. 101. In the second of these instances too the day of the battle, (the day of the full moon in question,) was purposely fixed upon by these invaders from the north themselves; and, knowing the regard which those nations in general paid to the full of the moon, we consider that coincidence alone competent to authenticate the Roman calendar at the same point of time. But it may also be shewn that both September 12 B. C. 105 and August 28 B. C. 101 exhibited the remarkable phenomenon of falling on the same day in the Allemannic, Cimbric, or Teutonic calendar of the epoch of October 26 B. C. 240[i]; viz. the sixth of the month: the former on the 6th of the xiith month B. C. 105, the latter on the 6th of the xiith month B. C. 101. We have only to suppose that these nations agreed with the Gauls in the traditionary respect which they paid to the *luna sexta*, and in the superior power and virtue which they attributed to that lunar date above any other; and we should account for this coincidence too. It is no difficulty that the same day in their calendar at this

[g] Plutarch, Lucullus, xxvii. Apophthegmata, Lucullus, i. Camillus, xix. Florus, iii. 3 § 4. Orosius, v. 16.

[h] Plutarch, Marius, xxvi. Polyænus, Strateg. viii. 10. Marius, 3. Orosius, v. 16: 17. Livy, lxviii. Plutarch, Marius, xxii. xxviii.

[i] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, i. 575. Diss. vii. ch. iii. sect. v.

point of time was both the *luna sexta* of the calendar and the day of the full moon also. For their calendar was Octaëteric; and consequently liable at stated times to such an anomaly.

SECTION V.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 13. 356 days.

U. C. 654 Varr. 653 Cap. 651 Polyb. B. C. 100.

C. Marius vi
L. Valerius Flaccus.

Kalendæ Januariæ January 24 B. C. 100. Nundinal Char. 8.

i. *On the dates of the Tribuneships of* L. Apuleius Saturninus.

This year, U. C. 654 B. C. 100, the sixth consulate of Marius is also the date of the death of the seditious Tribune L. Apuleius Saturninus[k]. It is calculated to illustrate our calendar in a remarkable manner. But we must begin with settling the number and order and dates of the successive Tribuneships of this Apuleius.

The factious proceedings of this demagogue began in the year of the fourth consulship of Marius, U. C. 652 B. C. 102; *in* which he appears in office as Tribunus plebis for the first time[l]. He would enter on that tribuneship Dec. 10 Roman U. C. 651 Dec. 11 Julian B. C. 103.

He was continued in office for the second year, U. C. 653 B. C. 101, in which Marius also was consul v; and it must have been at the comitia preliminary to his election for the second time that in conjunction with Glaucias the prætor he compassed the death of Nonius one of his competitors[m]. He would enter on office for this second year Dec. 10 Roman U. C. 652 Dec. 23 B. C. 102. And in the course of this second year he must have produced the impostor, whom he suborned to personate the character of the son of Tiberius

[k] Cicero, xviii. Pro Rabirio, 7, 10—11, 31: xix. In Catilinam, i: 2, 4: iii. 6, 15. Livy, lxix. Velleius Pat. ii. 12. Valerius Max. iii. ii. 18 De Fortitudine: viii. i. § 3 De Judiciis Pub. Damnati: vi. 2 Qui quæ in aliis, &c. Plutarch, Marius, xiv: xxiii: xxviii. Dio, xxxvii. 26: 10. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xii, 1 Orosius, v. 17. Auctor De Viris, L. Apuleius Saturninus.

[l] Plutarch, Marius, xiv. Diodorus, Frag. xxxvi.

[m] Valerius Max. ix. vii. 3 De Seditionibus. Appian, B. C. i. 28. Livy, lxix. Florus, iii. 16. § 1. Plutarch, Marius, xxix. Auctor De Viris: L. Apuleius. Orosius, v. 17.

Gracchus[n], under the name of Caius Gracchus; whom the Auctor De Viris[o] styles Quinctius; though his real name was Lucius Equitius, and his real father was a freedman of Firmum in Picenum. For we are told by Valerius Maximus[p] that he was thrown into prison by Marius in his sixth consulate[q]; no doubt because of his assumption of the character in question: (and if so, first in this year:) and that the people released him by force, and carried him out of prison in triumph on their own shoulders.

He was continued in office a third year, in the sixth consulate of Marius, U. C. 654 B. C. 100: and he would enter that year on Dec. 10 Roman U. C. 653, January 4 Julian B. C. 100. Cicero calls him Iterum tribunum at this time[r]; and it might truly be said that he had just been continued for the second time in an illegal and unconstitutional usurpation of the office: in which sense probably the observation was intended by Cicero. Appian too represents his *third* year as if it was only his second; but his first year in Appian was really his second; and this second year was really his *third*. In this year also, in conjunction with Marius, he carried into effect the design upon Metellus; which compelled him to retire for a time into voluntary exile[t].

The third tribunician year of Apuleius, mentioned by Appian after this[u], must in reality have been his *fourth*. But as he speaks of it as later than the banishment of Metellus, he must be understood to mean only his reelection against this third or this fourth year; between the time of that banishment and the end of the year. We hope to make it appear, when treating of a future calendar, that the voluntary secession of Metellus must have come in the latter half of B. C. 100. The tribunician comitia would be in course soon after it. But Apuleius, though then elected to the office a *fourth* time, might still be *de facto* only Tribunus plebis *tertium* almost up to the day of his death; as both Florus[w] and the Auctor De Viris represent him to have been: for he was

[n] Florus, iii. 16. § 1.
[o] Q. Cæcilius Metellus Numidicus.
[p] ix. vii. 1 De Seditionibus. Cf. iii. ii. 18 De Fortitudine: iii. viii. 6 De Constantia: ix. xv. 1 De Mentitis.
[q] Appian, B. C. i. 32.
[r] Oratio xxxii, Pro P. Sextio, 16, 37.
[s] B. C. i. 28: 31: 32.
[t] B. C. i. 29—31. Livy, lxix. Plutarch, Marius, xxviii. xxix. Florus, iii. 16. § 2, 3. Auctor De Viris, Q. Cæcilius Metellus Numidicus.
[u] B. C. i. 32.
[w] Florus, iii. 16. § 3.

killed at last at the very end or at the very beginning of the tribunician year. It confirms this that even after his re-election the comitia consularia were still to come[x]. And on the very day of those comitia, in conjunction with one of the candidates for the consulship, the prætor Glaucias, he committed the outrage on Memmius his competitor, which the next day led to the death of both of them, and to that of many others, associated in the same violent proceedings.

ii. *On the day of the death of Apuleius.*

It has been necessary to fix the chronology of these different tribuneships of Apuleius as accurately as possible, because it appears from Appian[y], as we have just observed, that the violence on the person of Memmius having been perpetrated in the forum or in the comitium, while the consular comitia were going forward, on *one* day, the people of Rome rose on Apuleius and his associates the *next* day; and compelled them to take refuge in the Capitol: and we learn from our other authorities, especially from Cicero, that the usual senatus decretum in cases of imminent danger, or critical emergency, Viderent consules ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet, having been previously passed, it was so speedily carried into effect that they were compelled to surrender at discretion the same day *, and were immediately put to death.

Appian tells us also that Lucius Equitius the supposititious son of Tiberius Gracchus, who too had been elected tribune of the people along with Apuleius at the last comitia, and with him too had taken refuge in the Capitol, was put to death on the same occasion. He describes both likewise as δήμαρχοι at the time, and as actually wearing the proper in-

* The pipes which supplied the Capitol with water were cut off by Marius; and they are said to have been driven to surrender themselves so speedily by thirst: Plutarch, Marius, xxx. Florus, iii, 16, 6. Orosius, v. 17. Auctor De Viris, L. Apuleius.

[x] B. C. i. 32, 33. Cf. Cicero, xviii, Pro Rabirio, 7, 20—11, 31: In Catilinam, i. 2, 4: iii. 6, 15: xxxii, Pro Sextio, 16, 37: xxxvii, In Pisonem, 2, 4: (cf. Asconius, p. 122:) I, Philippica, viii, 5, 15: Brutus, 62, 2. 24. Velleius Pat. ii. 12. Livy, lxix. Plutarch, Marius, xxx. Florus, iii. 16. § 4—7. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xii. 1. Auctor De Viris, C. Marius. Orosius, v. 17. Ampelius, Liber Memorialis, xxvi.

[y] B. C. i. 32, 33.

signia of their office, both when they surrendered themselves, and when they were put to death; Ἔτι περικειμένους τὰ σύμβολα τῆς ἀρχῆς. Apuleius who was Tribunus plebis previously might be wearing his official dress any time in the course of the preceding year; but Equitius, who had just been elected for the first time at the last tribunician comitia only, could not have been doing so before the very first day at least of his proper tribunician year. And that he was actually sacrificed to the popular fury or to the vengeance of the laws at the very beginning of his year appears from what Appian mentions of the circumstances of *his* death in particular; viz. That he was not only δήμαρχος at the time, i. e. officially tribune, but Πρώτην ἐκείνην δημαρχῶν ἡμέραν. He perished on the very first day of his proper tribunician year, or at the latest on the next to it; December 10 or 11 Roman U. C. 654, Dec. 25 or 26 Julian B. C. 100.

Now it may be further collected from Appian that *this* day was very probably the day after a *Nundinal* day. The account of the previous proceedings of the seditious tribune clearly demonstrates that his strength lay among the rustic tribes. It may be presumed that the day before, when the violence on Memmius was committed, these must have been present in Rome because of the consular election which was going on; and that is further implied by the fact that though the people of Rome resented the act of violence on Memmius with so much fury the next day, when they stormed the Capitol, their anger did not display itself by any overt act at the time: the best explanation of which apparent inconsistency in their conduct is that the day before they were overawed by the presence of Apuleius' supporters from the country; but that the next day, when they gave vent to their fury, these supporters of his were no longer on the spot: and consequently must have left Rome the day before. It appears too that before Apuleius himself even the next day durst venture to retreat to the Capitol he collected a body of followers from the country: Ὁ δ' ἄλλο πλῆθος ἀλίσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγρῶν κ', τ. λ.

Now it will be seen from our calendar that U. C. 654 B. C. 100 the character of the year being 8 that of December was 2: and therefore the 10th of December Roman was Nundinal.

And this day being both a Nundinal day and the ingress of his fourth tribuneship; it was as likely as any to be purposely fixed upon by Apuleius for the consular comitia at which he was endeavouring to secure the election of Glaucias against Memmius. We shall thus too account for the presence of the rustic voters in Rome on the same day in greater numbers than usual; and for the apparent acquiescence of the urban tribes in the recent act of violence, notwithstanding the indignation and resentment which it really excited in them *. We shall account also for Appian's language respecting the peculiar circumstances under which Equitius in particular met with his fate the next day; Πρώτην ἐκείνην δημαρχῶν ἡμέραν. For though it was in reality the day *after* the beginning of his year; yet it appears to have been the rule and custom of these times, (as we may have occasion to shew hereafter,) to date the actual assumption and actual assertion of a particular office and jurisdiction, whether consular, prætorian, or tribunician, not from the legal day of the ingress, but from the day after it: which in this present instance would be December 11 Roman U. C. 654, December 26 Julian B. C. 100.

SECTION VI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 17. 355 *days.*

U. C. 658 Varr. 657 Cap. 655 Polyb. B. C. 97—96.

Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus
C. Cassius Longinus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 16 B. C. 97. Nundinal Char. 2.

Date of the Vow of Marius U. C. 658.

The verification of our Roman calendar for this particular year is derivable from a comparison of the Roman with the Phrygian date of a certain ceremony; of which we had occa-

* It deserves to be mentioned also that December 10 Roman, Dec. 25 Julian, on which this act of violence was committed, was the 26th day of the moon; so that the night of that day would be dark: and even after the departure of the rustic tribes from Rome nothing could be done until the next morning, in the way of a general rising of the people of the city.

sion to make use for exactly the same purpose in illustration of our Roman calendar for U. C. 550 B. C. 204 also[z]. And though we cannot enter on the particulars of that comparison at present; yet we hope to shew on some future opportunity that Pridie Idus Apriles U. C. 658 and the stated date of the Sacra Phrygia at this period of the decursus of their proper calendar both met in the Julian March 25 B. C. 96: a coincidence which if true must be admitted to authenticate and confirm both these calendars at once.

The reader however will no doubt observe that three of the years of this fifth irregular cycle, U. C. 654 to 656 B. C. 100—B. C. 98, consisted of 356 days each; and though, ever since U. C. 547 B. C. 207 when years of that description were first introduced into the calendar, they might be considered in theory as admissible at any time, yet it must be allowed also that, having been formally discontinued from U. C. 554 B. C. 200 downwards, and never again resorted to except U. C. 578 and U. C. 582, B. C. 176 and B. C. 172, to find them revived for three years in sequence just at this time, U. C. 654 to U. C. 656, is something extraordinary: and perhaps is not capable of being explained except by special reasons of some kind or other.

In our opinion, there were such reasons in the present instance; though we cannot enter here on the proper account of them. All that we shall say on this subject is that the most eminent and most influential individual of his time C. Marius was under the obligation of a vow to the Mater Phrygia; which it was necessary to discharge both on her proper day in the Roman calendar, (which was Pridie Idus Apriles,) and on her proper day in the Phrygian, (in which it was cyclical or moveable,) at one and the same time: and in order to render that coincidence possible, it was necessary so to administer these three years in the Roman calendar, U. C. 654, U. C. 655, and U. C. 656, B. C. 100, B. C. 99, and B. C. 98, as to make them common, but common years of 356 days in length. Nor ought it to surprise us to find a particular management of the calendar expressly resorted to for such an object as this. It is notorious that the admi-

[z] Diss. xiii. ch. ii. sect. v. supra, p. 45.

nistration of the calendar during the irregular period was repeatedly made subservient to private views and private interests; to party considerations and to political sympathies: much more might it be purposely accommodated to meet the obligations and exigencies of a vow, contracted by a person of so much consequence as Caius Marius; and in times of the most imminent danger to the republic, and with a view to the common safety.

SECTION VII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 22. 355 *days*.

U. C. 663 Varr. 662 Cap. 660 Polyb. B. C. 92—91.

L. Marcius Philippus
Sex. Julius Cæsar.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 9 B. C. 92. Nundinal Char. 7.

i. *On the assumed date of Cicero's Dialogue* De Oratore; *and on the date of the death of* L. Crassus.

The historical or actual date of Cicero's Dialogue De Oratore was later than the year of his consulship, U. C. 691 B. C. 63[a]; and later than the year of his banishment U. C. 696 B. C. 58[a]. Middleton dates it conjecturally U. C. 699 B. C. 55[b]. In reality it appears to have been written before the month of November, B. C. 55[c].

Its assumed date however is U. C. 663, the consular year of L. Marcius Philippus Sextus Julius Cæsar, B. C. 92—91; at the stated season of the Ludi Romani in that year, as appears from the exordium[d]: Cum igitur vehementius inveheretur in caussam principûm consul Philippus, Drusique tribunatus pro senatus auctoritate susceptus infringi jam debilitarique videretur; dici mihi memini Ludorum Romanorum diebus L. Crassum quasi colligendi sui caussa se in Tusculanum contulisse. And this, or a little after it, was also the time of the tribunician comitia the same year; since it appears that among the parties present on this occasion one was C. Cotta, Qui tum tribunatum plebis petebat; and an-

[a] i. 1, 3. [b] Vita, ii. 87—89. [c] Ad Familiares, i. 9: Ad Attic. iv. 13. 16. [d] i. 7, 24.

other was P. Sulpitius, Qui deinceps eum magistratum petiturus videbatur*.

This meeting at the villa of Crassus took up three days; the dialogue itself only two; beginning on the second day[e]. It was held in the country, and in the open air; and on the first day under a plane tree, which is thus described: Nam me hæc tua platanus admonuit; quæ non minus ad opacandum hunc locum patulis est diffusa ramis quam illa cujus umbram secutus est Socrates (in the Phædrus of Plato).... et omnes in iis sedibus quæ erant sub platano consedisse dicebat[f].

The second day's conversation began in the morning at the second hour[g] by the bedside of Crassus; and continued to be held there until noon, when it was broken off for a time[h]. It was resumed in the afternoon, not however under the plane tree as before, but in the midst of a wood: In media sylva...est enim is maxime et opacus et frigidus (locus)... in sylvam venitur et ibi magna cum audiendi exspectatione considitur[i]. And this it appears was for the sake of the shade and cool. The heat of the weather is alluded to at the end of the first book, which is also the end of the first

* The comitia in question were actually held a few days after the death of Crassus, September 19 Roman. C. Cotta...paucis diebus post mortem Crassi depulsus per invidiam tribunatu non multis ab eo tempore mensibus ejectus est e civitate: De Oratore, iii. 3, 11: cf. Brutus, 88, 301—303. It is from this Cotta that Cicero supposes he had the account of the dialogue: (i. 7, 25, 26: 8, 29, 30: iii. 4, 16—5, 17:) at the assumed date of which he himself could have been only 15 or 16 years of age.

With regard to Sulpicius, he continues: Sulpicius autem...quibuscum privatus conjunctissime vixerat hos in tribunatu spoliare instituit omni dignitate...cui...ferro erepta vita est. He means his proceedings in favour of Marius and against Sulla, B. C. 88-87: cf. Velleius Pat. ii. 18: 19. Livy, lxxvii. Appian, B. C. i. 55-60. Plutarch, Marius, xxxiv. xxxv: Sulla, viii. x. Valerius Max. vi. v. 7 De Justitia: ix. vii. 1 De Seditionibus Militum Romanorum. Florus, iii. 21, 6-8. Eutropius, v. 3. Cicero, Brutus, 89, 306, 307: 63, 227: Ad Herennium, i. 15, 25: ii. 28, 45. Asconius, in Orat. Pro C. Cornelio, p. 96: In Orat. Contra Pisonem, p. 128.

[e] For the first day, see i. 7, 24: 26: 28 sq.: cf. 8, 29. For the second, i. 28: lib. ii. 3, 12: cf. 3, 13: 90: 367.
[f] i. 7, 28.
[g] ii. 3, 12, 13: cf. ii. 5, 20.
[h] ii. 90, 367, at the end: iii. 5, 17.
[i] iii. 5, 18.

day's discourse: Nam et Scævola, quoniam in Tusculanum ire constituit, paullum requiescet dum se *calor* franget; et nos ipsi quoniam id temporis est valetudini demus operam[k].

And that all this was going on at the time of the Ludi Romani appears not only from the passage already quoted but from another also, which occurs in the course of the first day's conversation: Cogebat enim me M. Marcellus hic noster, qui nunc Ædilis curulis est; et profecto nisi Ludos nunc faceret huic nostro sermoni interesset[l]: and from a third, which we meet with in that of the second day's: Nihil sane inquit Catulus: etenim vides esse Ludos[m].

The Ludi Romani or Magni are meant: and in the Julian calendar of aftertimes[n] these are noted from Pridie Nonas to Pridie Idus Septembres; September 4 Roman to September 12. And they appear to have been going on between these identical dates at this very time also. For Cicero sums up the history of Crassus, after the supposed termination of the dialogue, at the beginning of the third book, in these words: Nam illud immortalitate dignum ingenium illa humanitas illa virtus L. Crassi morte exstincta subita est vix *diebus decem* post *eum diem* qui hoc et superiore libro continetur[o]. Now both these books comprehend only *two* days. It follows consequently that Crassus must have died within *twelve* days of the beginning of the dialogue, as related in the first book. And Cicero gives us the following account of the circumstances which preceded his death[o].

Ut enim Romam rediit extremo scenicorum Ludorum die, vehementer commotus ea oratione quæ ferebatur habita esse in concione a Philippo[p]...mane *Idibus Septembris* et ille et senatus frequens vocatu Drusi in senatum venit. He returned therefore to Rome Pridie Idus Septembres; and that it seems was the last day of the Ludi also. The proceedings in the senate on the same occasion, in the midst of which Crassus was taken ill, are next related: Namque tum latus ei dicenti condoluisse sudoremque multum consecutum esse audiebamus: ex quo cum cohorruisset cum febri domum rediit, dieque septimo lateris dolore consumtus est..

[k] i. 62, 265. [l] i. 13, 57. [m] ii. 3, 13. [n] Maffæan, Amiternine, Capranic, and Antiatine apud Foggini. [o] iii. 1, 1–2, 6. [p] ii. 1, 3–2, 6. Cf. Valerius Max. vi. ii. 2 De libere dictis aut factis.

This would be September 19 Roman, the eighth day since his return on the Pridie Idus; and the ninth from the second day's dialogue reckoned *inclusively:* and consequently strictly within ten days from the end of the dialogue.

If however he returned to Rome on Pridie Idus Septembres and on the last day of the Ludi; the dialogue must have been held not on the first and second day of these Ludi, but on the seventh and eighth: September 10 and 11 Roman. The point which is to be attended to in the preceding allusions, with a view to the illustration of the calendar, is the description of the weather at the time; which every one must allow to be such as would accord to the Julian July or August much more appropriately than to the Julian September or October. The fever too with which Crassus was seized in the midst of his speech in the senate, and which carried him off on the seventh day, may be as probably explained by the heat of the weather at the time as by any other natural cause.

Now it appears from our calendar that the Kalends of January U. C. 663 fell on December 9 B. C. 92; and the Kalends of September on August 3 B. C. 91. Consequently September 10 Roman the date of the first day's dialogue was August 12: September 13 the date of the seizure of Crassus was August 15: and September 19 the date of his death was August 21. All this is natural and consistent; and that must render it extremely probable that it is historical also: in which case, it is calculated to confirm the arrangements of our calendar, for this part of the fifth irregular cycle, in a striking manner.

We will observe further only that the Nundinal character of September this year was 2: and consequently that September 10 was Nundinal. And that might be an additional reason why Crassus should have retired from Rome to his villa in the country the day before; viz. besides the heat of the weather, and the bustle and confusion produced by the games, in order to escape from the crowd and throng of the Nundinal resort: which at that time in particular would probably be greater than usual.

SECTION VIII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 23. 378 *days.*

U. C. 664 Varr. 663 Cap. 661 Polyb. B. C. 91–90.

L. Julius Cæsar
P. Rutilius Lupus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 29 B. C. 91. Nundinal Char. 4.

On the date of the death of the Consul Rutilius *U.C.*664*B. C.*90; *and on that of the Legate* Didius *U. C.* 665 *B.C.*89.

This was the first year of the Bellum Italicum, Sociale, or Marsicum: and we have already shewn[q] in what manner the circumstances under which it broke out are calculated to illustrate and confirm not only the Roman calendar of the time, but the more ancient Nundinal calendar, and the decursus of Etruscan sæcula. The war in question lasted three years at least: and it gave birth to other incidents in its progress which also are well adapted to illustrate our calendar. One or two of the most remarkable of this kind we shall proceed to adduce; without entering on the chronology of the war in detail.

Of this number then was the death of the consul Rutilius, of a wound received in battle with Vettius Cato one of the commanders of the allies[r]; which, it is agreed, was an event of the first year[s]: as indeed his being consul at the time alone would prove. The day of this event has been recorded by Ovid[t]; the feast day of the Roman Matuta, the Ino or Leucothea of the Greeks[u]: the proper name of which in the Roman style was the Matralia[w], and the proper day the iii Idus Junias[x], June 11 Roman both in the old calendar and in the Julian.

[q] Diss. xi. ch. ii. sect. iii. Vol. ii. 418.
[r] Appian, B. C. i. 40. 41–43.
[s] Ibid. i. 43. 40, 41. Livy, lxxiii. Velleius Pat. ii. 16. Obsequens, cxv. Florus, iii. 18, 12. Eutropius, v. 2. Orosius, v. 18. Diodorus, Fragm. xxxvii.
[t] Fasti, vi. 473–480. 546.
[u] Cf Cicero, De Natura Deor. iii. 19, 48: Tusculanæ, i. 12, 28. Servius, Ad Georg. i. 437: Ad Æn. v. 241. Plutarch, Camillus, v: De Fraterno Amore, xxi. Hyginus, Fabb. ii. Ino: cxxv. ccxxiv. Lactantius, i. 21.
[w] Cf. Varro, De Lingua Lat. iv. 31: v. 56. Festus, xi. 230. 12 Matralia.
[x] Cf. the Kalendaria apud Foggini, Maffæan, and Venusine; and Ovid, Fasti, vi. loc. cit.

Hanc tibi quo properas memorant dixisse Rutili!
Luce mea Marso cæsus ab hoste cades.
Exitus accessit verbis, flumenque Tolenum
Purpureo mixtis sanguine fluxit aquis[y].

Now it may be collected from Appian[z] that both the night before, and the night after, this battle were light: and that is shewn by our calendar to have been the case. The Matralia U. C. 664 fell upon May 29 B. C. 90; and, as there was an eclipse of the sun April 17, 3.15 P. M. Paris, there must consequently have been a full moon about May 30 next ensuing. The night consequently of May 28 and that of May 29 would be light almost throughout its entire duration.

It is added by Ovid that the next year also and on the same day of the same month, the Matralia U. C. 665, another of the Roman commanders fell in battle with the same enemies.

Proximus annus erat; Pallantide cæsus eadem
Didius hostiles ingeminavit opes[a].

The particulars of this event are not known. The fact itself appears to have been mentioned by Ovid only. Titus Didius however was actually one of the legati appointed at the beginning of the war[b] to act under the consuls Rutilius and Julius. He was probably the same person of whom a triumph is extant in the Fasti, De Celtiberis, celebrated in B. C. 93[c]. The date of the Matralia U. C. 665 was May 18 B. C. 89: and that was about the date of the full moon of May the same year also.

Section IX.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* v. 24. 355 *days.*

U. C. 665 Varr. 664 Cap. 662 Polyb. B. C. 90–89.

Cn. Pompeius Strabo
L. Porcius Cato.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 12 B. C. 90. Nundinal Char. 2.

The reduction of Asculum, the principal city of Picenum,

[y] Ovid Fasti, vi. 563.
[a] Fasti, vi. 567.
[z] i. 43.
[b] Appian, B. C. i. 40. Velleius Pat. ii. 16.
[c] Supra, ii. 90. No. xciii.

where too the rebellion had first broken out, was one of the events of this year. Siege was laid to it U. C. 664 by Cn. Pompeius Strabo in quality of legatus; and the next year by Sextus or Lucius Julius also, consul of U. C. 664, yet commanding at this time pro consule[d]. Consequently B. C. 90; and at the beginning of that year. Its reduction was effected by Cn. Pompeius as one of the consuls of this year, U. C. 665 B. C. 90[e]. The city was taken by him in the winter[f]. His colleague, Porcius Cato, was killed even after that event, still in the winter[g]: and the year of both began Dec. 12 B. C. 90, before the winter could be said to have set in, but not long before it. Subsequent moreover to the capture of Asculum, when 18000 of the Marsi, according to Orosius[h], were put to the sword, we have the following account given of the fate of 4000 more: Quatuor autem millia Italici viri ex ea cæde profugi jugum montis coacto in unum agmine conscenderant: ubi obpressi exanimatique nivibus miserabili morte riguerunt: that is, they were frozen to death; having been previously deprived by the cold of all power of motion or of helping themselves.

In like manner Appian also tells of the fate of another body of Marsi, 15000 in number, which had been sent to the assistance of the Tyrrhenians[i]; 5000 of whom Pompeius cut off, Ὕπατος ὢν ἤδη: and half of the remainder perished in retreating to their own country again, Δι' ἀπόρου χώρας καὶ χειμῶνος ἐπιπόνου, during which they supported themselves as well as they could on acorns, βαλανηφαγοῦντες. This event was earlier in Pompey's consular year than the last considered, or the capture of Asculum[i]. Both however prove that his year and Cato's must have entered very near the beginning of winter; and it actually did so December 12 B. C. 90. His Triumph De Asculanеis, &c. is extant in the Pasti[k]; but at the very end of his proper year, vi Kal. Janu-

[d] Appian, B. C. i. 47. 48. 50. Livy, lxxiv.

[e] Appian, loc. cit. Livy, lxxiv. lxxxv. Velleius Pat. ii. 21. Plutarch, Pompeius, iv. Florus, iii. 18, 14. Orosius, v. 18. 19.

[f] Appian, i. 47. 50. Cf. Velleius Pat. ii. 17. 21.

[g] Ibid.

[h] v. 18. 19: cf. 18. and Appian, B. C. i. 48.

[i] B. C. i. 50. Cf. Livy, lxxiv. Asculum was reduced after all these things, and after the death of the consul Cato; Orosius, v. 18.

[k] Vol. ii. 90. xciv. Cf. Velleius Pat. ii. 65. Dio, xliii. 51: xlix. 24. Valerius Max. vi. ix. 9 De Mutatione Morum.

arias U. C. 665, November 26 B. C. 89: and it has been left upon record that Ventidius, a celebrated commander of after-times, and the only Roman who ever triumphed De Parthis in a private capacity, was one of the Asculan captives exhibited on this occasion [k].

We learn also from Pliny [l] the date of another event of this war and in this year; that of the capture, or rather re-capture, of Stabiæ: for it had been taken by the confederates in the first year of the contest [m]. In Campano autem agro Stabiæ oppidum fuere usque ad Cn. Pompeium L. Catonem consules, Pridie Kal. Maii; quo die L. Sulla legatus bello sociali id delevit: quod nunc in villam abiit. That is, until April 6 B. C. 89. Yet Stabiæ is spoken of as if still in existence in Columella's time A. D. 49:

Fontibus et Stabiæ celebres et Vesvia rura [n].

Among the incidents of this year too we learn from Livy [o] that another was the death of A. Sempronius Asellio the Prætor Urbanus, brought about at Rome by a conspiracy of the usurers (feneratores), Quoniam secundum debitores jus dicebat. We need not enter again into the history of the laws relating to usury [p], nor of the various shifts and contrivances by means of which the lenders of money at Rome were perpetually scheming to evade them. It should however be observed that such inquiries into these evasions, as the Prætor in question was instituting at the time of his death [q], were most likely to be set on foot at the beginning of a fresh Lustral cycle, the usual term of credit. Now U. C. 665 was such a year; the first of the xcivth Lustral cycle: which entered January 2 Roman, December 13 Julian, B. C. 90; both which days were Nundinal as our Tables shew.

The most circumstantial account of his death is given by Appian [q]. He was beset by the usurers in a body, in the open Forum, or as Valerius Maximus states [r], Pro Æde Concordiæ, while engaged in the act of sacrificing to the Dios-

[k] Ibid. locis cit.
[l] H. N. iii. 9. 618.
[m] Appian, B. C. 1. 42.
[n] Lib. x. De Hortor. Cultu, 133: cf. Ovid. Metam. xv. 711. Pliny, Epp. vi. 16.
[o] lxxiv.
[p] Vol. ii. 438.
[q] Appian, B. C. 1. 54.
[r] ix. vii. 4. De Seditionibus.

curi (Castor and Pollux): and having attempted in vain to take refuge in the temple of Vesta, he was pursued by them into a tavern, and there assassinated. And hence we collect with certainty the date of this act of violence; the feast-day of Castor and Pollux in the Roman calendar: which from the time of the battle of the Lake Regillus was always the Ides of Quinctilis[s]. The Ides of Quinctilis U. C. 665 fell on June 20 B. C. 89. It is clear from the context of Appian that, though there was a crowd in the Forum at the time, it was not a Nundinal day; and the character of Quinctilis this year being 1 the 15th was not Nundinal.

SECTION X.—*On the dates of the Births of Cicero, of Pompey the Great, and of Julius Cæsar respectively.*

After these illustrations and these proofs of the truth of our Roman Fasti through this fifth Irregular Cycle we might dismiss this cycle from any further consideration, as sufficently verified and confirmed. It is however proper to observe i. That the dates of five triumphs are still extant which fell in the course of it, B. C. 105, B. C. 97, B. C. 93, and B. C. 89[t]: all which stand clear of the Nundinal day, and one fell on the day after it. ii. That the births of three of the most illustrious individuals of their time, (though in different ways and on different accounts,) Cicero, Pompey, and Cæsar, all came within the limits of this cycle; and we should perhaps not be excused if we took our leave of it without some notice of each of these in its turn.

i. The oldest of these eminent characters was M. Tullius Cicero. His birthday in the style of the Roman calendar was iii Nonas Januarias U. C. 648, the consular year of C. Atilius Serranus Q. Servilius Cæpio[u], January 3 Roman that year, December 28 Julian B. C. 107: a date which Plutarch, in his Life of Cicero, expresses in a singular manner[w]: Τεχθῆναι δὲ Κικέρωνα λέγουσιν ἀνωδύνως καὶ ἀπόνως λοχευθείσης αὐτοῦ τῆς μητρὸς ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ τῶν νέων καλανδῶν, ἐν ᾗ νῦν οἱ ἄρχοντες εὔχονται καὶ θύουσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος. He means on the

[s] Vol. ii. 107. No. vii. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla, viii: xxviii.

[t] Supra, Vol. ii. 89, 90.

[u] A. Gellius, xv. 28: cf. Cicero ad Attic. vii. 5: vii. 4: xiii. 42: cf. iii. 20: xi. 9 B. C. 48. Brutus, 43, 161: 64, 230. De Legibus, ii. 2, 3–3, 6: iii. 16, 36. Thesaurus Temp. Ol. 168. 3.

[w] Cap. ii.

day of the Vota Publica in his time, i. e. under the emperors; which was notoriously January 3 [x].

From this day consequently to that of his death, vii Idus Decembres [y], December 7 Roman U. C. 711 December 5 Julian B. C. 43, the interval in annual and noctidiurnal Roman time was 63 years, eleven months, four days; in Julian was 63 years, eleven months, seven days: and this latter would be the correct description of his age at his death; so that those of the ancients who have represented him as 64 years old at that time are more in the right than those who have spoken of him as even then only 63 [z].

ii. The next in point of age to Cicero was Cn. Pompeius Magnus; born in the same consular year [a], but Pridie Kalendas Octobres, September 29 Roman, U. C. 648, September 17, B. C. 106: the same day nominally on which he celebrated his triumph De Mithridate, B. C. 61 [b]; and the same day nominally on which he was killed B. C. 48: so that, according to the Roman reckoning, he might truly be represented as 58 years old exactly [c] at the time; though, as the Julian date of September 29 Roman B. C. 48 was July 24, his true age, reckoned from September 17 B. C. 106, at his death, was 57 years, ten months, 7 days *.

iii. The youngest of these illustrious individuals was Caius Julius Cæsar. It is known that his birthday in the style of

* Great uncertainty seems to have prevailed, (and at a very early period too,) respecting the age of Pompey. See Vell. Pat. ii. 53. Valerius Max. v. ii. 9 De Gratitudine, and Tac. Ann. xiii. 6, make him 18 U. C. 671 B. C. 83 (cf. Livy, lxxxv) though he was really 23 at that time. Cf. Plutarch, Vita, vi. Appian, B. C. ii. 86. The Fasti Triumphales date his first triumph (Ex Africa,) U. C. 672 Cap.; at which time he was 25; and so the Epitome of Livy, lxxxix, and the Auctor De Viris, Cn. Pompeius Magnus, represent his age at that time. Cf. Eutropius, v. 6. Appian, B. C. i. 121 makes him 34 U. C. 683 B. C. 71: and (Mithridatica 12. 6) 35 at his triumph U. C. 693 B. C. 61, when he was 45 complete at least. Cf. Plutarch, Pompeius, xlvi: lxxiii.

[x] Cf. Historiæ Aug. SS. Adrian, 23. Ælius Verus, 4: 3. Pertinax, 6. Tacitus, 9. Tacitus, Ann. iv. 17: 70. Tertullian, Opp. iv. 357. De Corona Mil. 12. Lydus, De Mensibus, iv. 10. 57. 3–58. 8. Constantian calendar, Jan. 3. Also our Dissertations, iv. 421 and note.

[y] Tacitus, De Caussis, 17: cf. 24.

[z] See Livy, cxx. Seneca, Suasoriæ, vii. 39–43: viii. 50. Plutarch, Cicero, xlviii. Cassiodorius, in Anno.

[a] Velleius Paterculus, ii. 53: cf. 29. Thesaurus Temporum, Ol. 168. 3.

[b] Supra, Vol. ii. 98. No. xcviii.

[c] Appian, B. C. ii. 86. Velleius Pat. ii. 53. Plutarch, Pompeius, lxiv. lxxix. Zonaras, x. 9. 487 C.

the Roman calendar was iv Idus Quinctiles or Julias, July 12 Roman; one of the stated days of the Ludi Apollinares[d]. But the year of his birth is somewhat doubtful. Suetonius[e], Plutarch[f], and Appian[g] tell us that he was *in* his 56th year at his death (the Ides of March, U. C. 710 B. C. 44): Eutropius[h] on the other hand states that he was *in* his 56th year at the time of the battle of Munda, the Liberalia, March 17 Roman, the year before; U. C. 709 B. C. 45. The former would give his birthday July 12 Roman U. C. 654, July 31 Julian B. C. 100: the latter July 12 Roman U. C. 653, August 10 Julian B. C. 101. In our opinion, this latter was his true birthday *. And from this day August 10 B. C. 101 to

* We ground this opinion chiefly on the following considerations. It appears from Cicero[1] that the consular age at Rome in his time and in that of Cæsar was not less than 42 years complete. Now Cæsar was certainly consul Ex Kalendis Januariis U. C. 695 B. C. 59: and as there is no reason to suppose that he was consul before *his year*, or that the Lex Annalis was dispensed with in his behalf, we look upon this as a demonstrative proof that he could not have been less than 42, (nominally at least if not complete,) in his consular year U. C. 695; and that would be the case if he was born iv Idus Quinctiles U. C. 653 but not if he was born iv Idus Quinctiles U. C. 654.

We have seen from the case of Scipio Æmilianus the younger, B. C. 148[2], that the legal age of the Ædileship was 36: in his case, if he was born B. C. 184, 36 complete. Cicero tells us[3] that he was Ædile in his proper year: and he was Ædile U. C. 685 B. C. 69[4], having been elected the year before, U. C. 684. In this year he was 36 complete: for U. C. 648 + 36 = 684. Now Cæsar also was Ædile U. C. 689 B. C. 65[5]; in his 37th year dated from U. C. 653, but his 36th only dated from U. C. 654.

The Quæstorian age seems to have been 30. Appian records of U. C. 710 B. C. 44[6] that permission was given that year to Caius Cæsar (Augustus) to be capable of the consulship Τοῦ *νόμου θᾶττον ἐτῶν δέκα*;

1 Oratio xlvii, Philippica, v. 17. 48: cf. xvi, De Lege Agraria, ii Contra Rullum, 2, 3: 4. Brutus, 94, 323: cf. Alexander ab Alexandro, iii. cap. 3 ad fin.

2 Supra, p. 210, note.

3 De Officiis ii. 17, 59.

4 Cf. Brutus, 92, 319.

5 Dio, xxxvii. 8: cf. 1: 10: Suetonius, Vita, ix: x. Plutarch, Vita, v. vi. Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 16.

6 B. C. iii. 51: cf. 88.

d Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 12. 261. Lydus, De Mensibus, iv. 63. 95. l. 4. Kalendaria, apud Foggini, Amiternine, and Antiatine: cf. Dio, xliv. 5: xlvii. 18.

e Julius, lxxxviii. 1: cf. i § 1: iv. § 1. Tacitus, De Caussis, 34.

f Vita, lxix.

g B. C. ii. 149: cf. Dio, xliv. 7.

h vi. 19.

the day of his death, March 15 Roman March 13 Julian B. C. 44, the interval in Julian time would be 56 years, seven months, three days.

and as he was then in his 20th year, this must imply that the first legal age was 30. Dio[7] will shew that the Quæstorship not the Consulship was really meant in this instance.

Cicero was a candidate for the Quæstorship U. C. 678 B. C. 76[8]; and quæstor the next year U. C. 679 B. C. 75. Consequently in his 32d year dated from January 3 Roman U. C. 648. This proves that 30 complete at least was the legal age of the Quæstura. Cæsar was quæstor U. C. 687 B. C. 67[9]; when he would be in his 34th year dated from July 12 Roman U. C. 653. So that he could not have served that office in his proper year; i. e. as soon as he was eligible.

In one of the Panegyrici Veteres[10], we find it observed: An vero quicquam putamus in imperii tui declaratione præteritum, cum ductam esse rationem ipsorum etiam videamus annorum? cujus quidem rei tanta fuit cura majoribus ut non solum in amplissimis magistratibus adipiscendis sed in præturis quoque aut ædilitatibus capessendis ætas spectata sit petitorum: nec quisquam tantum valuerit nobilitate vel gratia vel pecunia qui annos comitiali lege præscriptos festinatis honoribus occuparit. As Theodosius was 35 when he was made emperor, this also implies that the age of the Ædileship at least must have been 35 or 36.

Julius Cæsar was elected Prætor U. C. 691 B. C. 63[11]—when he would be in his 39th year. And this may imply that the legal age of the Prætura was 38 complete.

7 xlvi. 29. 8 Brutus, 92, 318.

9 Suetonius, Julius, vii: viii: cf. i. 1. Plutarch, Cæsar, v.

10 xii. Pacati Theodosio Imperatori dictus, A. D 391: vii. 2. An epigram is extant in the Greek Anthology which proves that 42 was still reckoned to be the proper consular age as late as the sixth century; Anthol. iii. 176. Christodorus, ii. Cf. 177. iii.

11 Suetonius, Julius, xiii: xiv: xv: cf. xlvi. Plutarch, Cæsar, ix: xi. Cicero, Ad Attic. i. 12: xii. 21. Dio, xxxix. 39: 44.

DISSERTATION XVII.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar. Cycle vi.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 1. 378 days.

U. C. 666 Varr. 665 Cap. 663 Polyb. B. C. 89–88.

L. Cornelius Sulla (Felix)
Q. Pompeius Rufus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 1 B. C. 89. Nundinal Char. 7.

i. *Date of the Isia in the Roman Calendar,* U. C. 666.

IN the collection of ancient Latin and Greek inscriptions, first published by Marquardus Gudius and afterwards by Hesselius[i], there is one to the following effect:—

MAGNAE . ISIDIS . SACRVM
M . VPSAEVS . M . F . M . N . PLAN
CVS . AEDIL . CVRVL . AEDIC
FACIVN . COERAVIT . ET . D . D
IIII . NON . JANVAR . GN . POM
PEIO . STRABONE . ET . L . POR
CIO . CATONE . COS

That is,

Magnæ Isidis sacrum Marcus Hypsæus Marci filius Marci nepos Plancus Ædilis Curulis Ædibus faciundis cu-

[i] Leovardiæ, 1731. Folio. [k] Page xxi. No. 8.

ravit et donum dedit iiii Nonas Januarias Gneio Pompeio Strabone et Lucio Porcio Catone Consulibus *.

It is evident then that this inscription belongs apparently to the consular year of Pompeius and Cato U. C. 665 Varr. B. C. 90—89; but whether it does so in reality will appear more clearly by and by. It is the earliest testimony extant to the performance of a public ceremony at Rome in honour of the Egyptian goddess Isis. Proof indeed is in existence that her worship had been introduced into Rome long before this time[1]; but there is nothing to be met with any where, so far as we know, which would imply that she had yet been publicly recognized at Rome, or that any act of worship had been celebrated to her there by public authority. It is an observable coincidence that the apparent date of this inscription and of the ceremony recorded upon it, the consular year of Pompeius and Strabo, U. C. 665 B. C. 90—89, is that too

* This collection of Gudius was compiled in part from the materials amassed by Pyrrhus Ligorius who flourished about A. D. 1553; and whether the authenticity of that collection was to be implicitly depended on has been made a question among the learned in Inscriptions. For the defence however of Ligorius and the vindication of his authority we refer to the Præfationis Appendix of Hesselius. There must have been much in this collection (30 volumes) which was a genuine relict of antiquity, though every thing contained in it might not be so.

It appears to us that the internal evidence of the inscription, as above produced, is entirely in favour of its genuineness. Hypsæus was a contemporary *nomen gentilitium* at Rome. An Hypsæus was prætor in the first Bellum Servile (that of Eunus in Sicily) U. C. 620 B. C. 134. Florus, iii. 19, 7. Livy, lvi. Diodorus, Fr. xxxiv. Obsequens, lxxxvi. Cf. also the Fasti Consulares, U. C. 629 B. C. 125. Valerius Max. ix. v. 1 De Superbia. Frontinus, De Aquæductis, 162, 8. Cicero, De Oratore, i. 36. 166. Asconius, Pro Milone, p. 140. Dio, xl. 53. Appian, B. C. ii. 24: B. C. 52.

It is observable that the H is wanting before the Y in this name, and that the Y is in the form of the V: as if it had been in the Greek character, ΥΠΣΑΙΟΣ: and this too is a mark of antiquity and genuineness. The Ædiles, both curule and plebeian, were Æditui ex officio and Ædibus curandis: cf. Festus, xiv. 351. 6 Plebei Ædiles: and i. 13. 1 Ædilis. The use of the œ too for the v in the word cœravit is another mark of antiquity and of genuineness. Cf. Cicero, De Legibus, iii. 3, 7 cœratores: 3, 9 œnus, for unus: 4, 10 cœret: cœrandi: cœratore œsus sit, for curatore usus sit. Ibid: Quod œsus erit.

[1] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, Vol. ii. 442, note.

in which the first war of Mithridates with the Romans broke out. It is mentioned by Obsequens[m] of the year next to this, the year of Sulla and Pompeius, U. C. 666 B. C. 89–88, that among the prodigies which occurred to Mithridates, when he was embarking on this war, one was *this*; that Isidis species visa fulmine petere: i. e. seemed to discharge a thunderbolt, no doubt as if aiming at the king; since this was construed into an ill omen for his future success in the war *. If this prodigy happened before the first overt act of hostility committed by Mithridates, that of the occupation of the dominions of Nicomedes king of Bithynia, and afterwards of Proconsular Asia which belonged to the Roman people, U. C. 666 B. C. 88[n]; it no doubt preceded the year of Sulla U. C. 666: and it might have occurred early enough the year before to have become known at Rome in the course of that year, B. C. 89. At the siege of Rhodes also, in this year of Sulla's consulship B. C. 88[o], we are told by Appian[p] that the engine of Mithridates employed in the siege, which he calls the Σαμβύκη, from its likeness to an instrument of music (of a triangular shape) so termed among the Greeks, was brought up to attack the city opposite to a part where there was a temple of Isis. On that occasion too Φάσμα τῆς Ἴσιδος ἔδοξε πῦρ ἀφιέναι πολὺ κατ' αὐτοῦ; and this circumstance is supposed to have had its effect in inducing him to raise the siege: which he did forthwith.

It is therefore a very possible supposition that the Romans having heard of something which was said to have happened in Asia, just on the eve of this dangerous and critical war, and appeared to intimate that Isis in particular was displeased at it, and had expressed her disapprobation of the step which Mithridates was taking in a very significant man-

* In like manner Plutarch mentions a dream of Sulla's, Vita, ix, in which the Cappadocian goddess Ἐννώ, Σελήνη, (Bellona or Minerva,) appeared to him to put a thunderbolt in his hands, bidding him launch it at the head of each of his enemies.

[m] cxvi.

[n] Appian, Mithridatica, xvii: xx—xxiii: lviii: lxii. Livy, lxxvii: lxxviii. Vell. Pat. ii. 18. Plutarch, Sulla, xxiv. Cf. Cicero, xiii, Pro Lege Manilia, 3, 7: 5, 11. Photius, Codex 224. p. 230, 16. 231, 6. Val. Max. ix. ii. 3 De Crudelitate, Externa.

[o] Appian, Mithridatica, xxii: xxiv—xxvii: B.C. i. lv. Livy, lxxviii. Velleius Pat, ii. 18.

[p] Mithridatica, xxvii.

ner, might have been induced thereby to regard her in the light of their friend; and under the influence of that feeling might have directed the performance of some public act of worship at Rome in honour of her. Nor could such an object of worship as the Egyptian Isis have been unknown to them, at least by name; long before this time. The proper day however for an act of this kind must be borrowed from the Egyptian calendar; just as U. C. 550 B. C. 204 the proper day for a similar ceremony in honour of the Phrygian Cybele had been borrowed from the Phrygian. The stated ceremony in the Egyptian calendar in honour of Isis was the Isia; and in their own calendar the Isia lasted four days: but we have shewn in our former work [q] that, from the distinction of this common ceremony of the Isia into two parts, altogether different in their character one from the other, none of these days could have been borrowed with propriety for the use of the Romans on this occasion, but the fourth or last; the stated date of which was the 20th of the third month of the Egyptian calendar, the 20th of the Egyptian Athyr.

Now Nab. 660 the first of Thoth bore date Sept. 14 B. C. 89; and therefore the first of Athyr Nov. 13: the 17th, Nov. 29; the 20th, Dec. 2. The Kalends of January U. C. 666 bore date Dec. 1 B. C. 89; and therefore iv Nonas Januarias bore date Dec. 2: i. e. on Athyr 20 Nab. 660, the fourth and last day of the Egyptian Isia the same year. This coincidence must do much to demonstrate the genuineness and authenticity of the inscription which records this date, if there is still any doubt concerning it; and also to confirm the conclusion that the year of this *Sacrum* Isidis was truly U. C. 666 not 665: and that Jan. 2 Roman in that year was purposely selected for it because it coincided with the only day which could be properly called the feastday or holiday of Isis in her own calendar, Athyr 20.

It is no objection that iv Nonas Januarias, Jan. 2 Roman, was a *dies postriduanus*. We have already seen that there was reason to doubt whether the Postridie Nonas in particular had really acquired the character of *religiosus* by U. C. 586 B. C. 168 [r]; but in any case, if the date of the ceremony

[q] Fasti Catholici, Diss. xiv. ch. iii. sect. v. Vol. iii. 85. [r] Supra, p. 155, 156. Cf. also note, page 102.

in the present instance was to be taken from the Egyptian calendar, whatsoever might be the Roman date which happened to be coinciding with this Egyptian one for the time being, its own character must be considered to have been merged in the Egyptian. Whether religious in its own calendar or not, it would be *Festus* and *Faustus* for this time and for this purpose, as the representative of the Egyptian date. It would be in fact the Egyptian merely under a Roman name.

It is a much more formidable objection at first sight that iv Nonas Januarias U.C. 666 Dec. 2 B. C. 89 on this principle, even as the date of the Sacrum Isidis in question, ought to have been found recorded in the consular year of Sulla and Pompeius, not in that of Pompeius and Cato; and this objection would be very difficult to get over indeed, could it be proved from testimony of any kind that the consular year of Sulla and Pompeius did actually begin on the Kalends of January U. C. 666, Dec. 1 B. C. 89. But the confusion of these times in general, and just about this point of time in particular, was such, that nothing can be considered less improbable *a priori* than that the Kalends of January U. C. 666 might actually have arrived and yet no consuls have been actually even then appointed. The consul Rutilius had fallen in battle U. C. 664 as early as June 11 Roman; and yet no consul suffectus was appointed in his stead for the rest of that year[s]: nor do we read of any in the room of Cato the colleague of Pompeius, U. C. 665, though he too must have been killed early in the year.

The triumph of this consul, Pompeius Strabo, as we have already mentioned[t], was celebrated late in his year, Dec. 25 Roman U. C. 665, Nov. 26 Julian B. C. 89. It proves that he himself must have been at Rome on the Kalends of January U.C. 666, and the day after; when we suppose this Sacrum Isidis to have been performed. As to the consular comitia and consular elections of U. C. 665, all we know about them is that Sulla is said to have left the scene of action among the Hirpini and the Samnites to repair to Rome, in order to be a candidate at them[u]; but according

[s] Appian, B. C. i. 44. Appian, B. C. i. 51.

[t] Supra, p. 266.

[u] Livy, lxxv.

to Appian not until after the beginning of winter: Χειμῶνος ἐπιόντος: which could not describe an earlier time in the natural year than the second week in November. Nothing then can be more probable than that the consular comitia on this occasion were actually held in the Roman January U. C. 666*; later at least than the second of that month: in which case, there being *de facto* no consuls under whom this *Sacrum* Isidis, if actually performed on that day, could possibly have been recorded, but those of the preceding year; this very fact of its being actually recorded under them, which at first sight appears the most formidable objection to its authenticity, turns out to be the strongest confirmation of it.

ii. *On the cases on record of the celebration of the Egyptian Isia at Rome, later than U. C.* 666 *B. C.* 89–88.

With a view however to the further confirmation of the authenticity of the preceding inscription and of the Roman date of this first Sacrum Isidis performed at Rome by public authority, it will be worth our while to bring together certain other cases of the celebration of the Sacra Ægyptia at Rome, of later occurrence; and to compare the dates of these too, as far as they can be determined, with that of this first of the kind: from which comparison we may perhaps be better able to judge whether every instance of this kind was regulated by one and the same rule; or whether there was not something peculiar to the first which does not appear to have held good of the rest.

It is not indeed (from defect of data) in our power to trace the history of the worship of Isis at Rome, after this first apparent recognition of it by authority, from B. C. 89 downwards. We learn however from Apuleius[w] that a college of Pastophori (the most proper name of the priests of Isis out of

* It may be some argument that Sulla was elected after the usual time, and that his year consequently must have been abridged more or less at its beginning, that there was a Merkedonius this year, which cannot be dispensed with. It might have been purposely inserted to lengthen the year. The Pontifex Maximus at this time was Q. Mucius Scævola; and he seems to have been a friend of Sulla's; to have belonged at least to the same party in politics as Sulla: cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 26.

[w] Fasti Catholici, ii. 449 note.

Egypt[x]) was established even among the Romans, B. C. 81 or 80, with the sanction of Sulla himself; who was at that time absolute and at liberty to do what he pleased: and very probably too that her oldest temple at Rome, the temple in Campo[w], from which she derived her peculiar Roman style and title of Regina Campensis, was founded at the same time. *This* temple of Isis appears to have been ever after respected; and often as we read in subsequent Roman history of the demolition of Fana or Ædes, Τεμενίσματα, Τεμένη, Temples or Chapels, any where else in or about Rome, nominally sacred to Isis, there is no proof that this Ædes in Campo was ever molested, or intended to be so: which in our opinion is a decisive argument that it had been erected in the first instance by *authority*.

The second of January Roman however having once been consecrated to the service of this Egyptian goddess by the performance of a *Sacrum Publicum* to her upon it; nothing could be more natural than that it should have come to be regarded as her proper and stated day in the Roman calendar. It is notorious that just the same kind of coincidence U. C. 550 fixed and determined the stated day of the Mater Idæa, the Mater Phrygia or Mater Deum, in the Roman calendar to Pridie Idus Apriles: and that this day never ceased to be recognized and treated as her's from U. C. 550 downwards, on the strength of that coincidence. In this manner at least do the common people of Rome appear to have reasoned; viz. that January 2 in their calendar having been once devoted to the service of Isis, and by authority too, it was *her's* ever after: and it would be difficult to prove that they had not common sense on their side. Accordingly, when we come down to U. C. 696 B. C. 58, the consular year of Piso and Gabinius, we find a fact on record, (the ultimate authority for which seems to have been the testimony of Varro in some one of his lost works,) from which it may very probably be inferred that down to *this* year at least, U. C. 696, the second of January Roman, in the popular opinion and belief, was still recognized as the proper day of Isis in the Roman calendar; the day which belonged to her, and was bound to be devoted to her.

[x] Fasti Catholici, ii. 456 note.

[w] Ibid. loc. cit.

There are two passages in Tertullian which lead to this inference; one in his Apologeticus, the other in his Adversus Nationes. The first is this[y]: Serapidem et Isidem et Harpocratem cum suo Cynocephalo Capitolio prohibitos inferri, id est curia deorum pulsos, Piso et Gabinius consules non utique Christiani eversis etiam aris eorum abdicaverunt, turpium et otiosarum superstitionum vitia cohibentes. his vos restitutis summam majestatem contulistis. The second is this[z]: Ceterum Serapem et Isidem et Arpocratem et Anubem prohibitos Capitolio Varro commemorat, eorumque statuas a senatu dejectas non nisi per vim popularium restructas. sed tamen et Gabinius consul Kalendis Januariis, cum vix hostias probaret præ popularium cœtu, quia nihil de Serapide et Iside constituisset (sc. senatus) potiorem habuit senatus censuram quam impetum vulgi, et aras institui prohibuit. And with both we may compare the following of Arnobius[a]: Quid? vos Ægyptiaca numina quibus Serapis atque Isis est nomen non post Pisonem et Gabinium consules in numerum vestrorum retulistis deorum? The meaning of which is that, though a public mark of reprobation and rejection had been set on these divinities in *that consular year* more particularly, the record of which still remained in the Fasti, they had since been received into the Pantheon.

In our opinion these testimonies authorize the inference that down to the consular year of Piso and Gabinius, U. C. 696, one day in the Roman calendar, which was either the Kalends of January or the next to it, must have been still recognized by the common people as sacred to Isis. It appears from them that she must have had altars at Rome, which the senate had recently ordered to be overthrown; and which the people would have rebuilt on the Kalends of January, the very first day of this consular year, but for the firmness of the consul Gabinius: and that they were so much in earnest about it, and crowded about him in such numbers, in order to carry their point either by intimidation or by importunity, that he could scarcely inspect and judge of the victims required for the stated sacrifices at the beginning of the new year. Why were the people so anxious to have her altars

[y] v. 19. Apologeticus, 6: cf. 20. 6. [z] v. 145. Ad Nationes, i. 11.
[a] ii. 95. Cf. iv. 147.

rebuilt on the first of January, except that they might be ready for her stated *Sacrum* on the next day? There was no connection between the 2nd of January Roman U.C. 696, and the Egyptian Isia Nabon. 690. The Isia were falling Nov. 22–25 B. C. 59: and the 2nd of January U. C. 696 on January 29 B. C. 58. And this latter date is so well ascertained in our calendar for the time that it is impossible it could have been otherwise. If then the people were contending for any day at the beginning of their own January, U.C. 696, as the right of Isis; it must have been solely because of the connection established between Isis and the second of their own January, U. C. 666.

It does not appear however that on this occasion they carried their point. On the contrary the authority of the senate, supported by the firmness of the consul, must have succeeded in separating that connection from this time forward for ever. We may date the suppression of the iv Nonas Januarias, as the recognized date of the Sacrum Isidis in the Roman calendar, in this year U. C. 696; but not the suppression of the worship of Isis herself at Rome: which long survived this attempt to proscribe it; and in spite of repeated prohibitions and checks maintained its footing until it was finally sanctioned by the emperors themselves [b].

To proceed then with our proposed review of recorded cases of the Isia at Rome.

i. In Dio's account of the incidents of U.C. 702[c], or rather of the end of U.C. 701, B.C. 53—52[d]; it is mentioned *obiter* that, Ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ [e], just as the year was going out, the temples of Isis and Serapis were demolished by order of the senate: and he tells us that these were Ναοὶ οὓς ἰδία τινὲς ἐπεποίηντο; the work of private individuals: clearly intending it to be understood thereby that, though both these Egyptian divinities had plenty of private worshippers at Rome, neither of them had yet been publicly recognized there; as they had long been in Dio's own time. He does not indeed say that the Isia had just been going on. Yet since it appears from subsequent cases of the same kind that the moving cause of these acts of severity on the part of the senate, directed

[b] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, ii. 453. [c] xl. 47. [d] xl. 1. 45, 46. [e] xl. 47.

against Isis or Serapis in particular, was the recent performance of their proper Sacra, in the city and before their eyes, and by Romans, (though contrary to law, and in their own nature highly offensive to the old Roman sense of gravity, decorum, and propriety,) nothing is more probable than that they had just been performed on this occasion. Now Nab. 696 the first of Thoth bore date Sept. 5 B. C. 53: the first of Athyr Nov. 4: and therefore the Isia, Nov. 20—23. The Kalends of January U. C. 702 (Cycle vii. 13) bore date Nov. 24 B.C. 53: i. e. the very day after the last day of the Isia. Nothing then could agree more exactly to Dio's description of the time, Ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ἔτους. Yet it was strictly *before* the end of U. C. 701; and not after the beginning of U. C. 702. *These* Sacra therefore must have been celebrated in conformity to the Egyptian rule; not to the Roman.

ii. Again speaking of U. C. 706 B. C. 48 exeunte[f], Dio observes: Μέλισσαι ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ παρὰ τὸν Ἡρακλέα ἱδρύθησαν. ἐτύγχανε γὰρ ἱερὰ Ἴσιδι τότε γιγνόμενα· ἔδοξε γνώμῃ τῶν μαντέων πάντα αὖθις τά τε ἐκείνης καὶ τὰ Σαράπιδος τεμενίσματα κατασκάψαι: from which we learn that, though demolished by authority so lately as B. C. 53, they had nevertheless been rebuilt by B. C. 48; and that will make it cease to appear any thing extraordinary that, though the altars of Isis had been publicly thrown down B. C. 58, she had nevertheless not only altars but temples B. C. 53.

Nab. 701 the first of Thoth bore date Sept. 4 B. C. 48; the first of Athyr Nov. 3: the Isia Nov. 19—22; the Roman date of which U. C. 707 Cycle vii. 18 was Pridie Kalendas Feb.—iii Nonas Feb.: January 29 Roman to Feb. 3 Roman. Dio indeed seems to describe this as one of the events of the year which was going out, not of that which was coming in; but this kind of confusion between the end of one year and the beginning of another is nothing unusual at this period of his history: and in fact, owing to the irregularity of the calendar, it could scarcely have been avoided; for the Roman February had now got into the Julian month of November, and into the stated month of the Isia in the Alexandrine calendar of Dio's time. It would be a greater difficulty that

[f] xlii. 26, 27: 20, 21.

he alluded to a swarm of bees about the same time as these Egyptian sacra; (that is, in the month of November, B. C. 48;) did he not himself supply us with an answer to that objection, by relating the fact of a similar phenomenon U. C. 711 B. C. 43 [g], when the Triumviri, Antony, Lepidus, and Cæsar Octavianus, had only just come to Rome. For that was certainly some days later than their meeting at Bononia [h]; and yet the date of that according to Sigonius [i] was v Kalendas Decembres, Nov. 27=25, the same year *.

iii. Again, in the account of U. C. 726 B. C. 28, when Augustus was both consul vi and censor, along with Agrippa [k], mention is made by Dio [l] of another prohibition of these Ἱερὰ Αἰγύπτια— not indeed absolutely, but within the precincts of the city, Ἔξω τοῦ Πωμηρίου: which implies that beyond the Pomœrium, (as in the Campus Martius,) they might be, and probably were, tolerated †. The context of Dio seems to determine the time of this occurrence too to the end of the year; the viith consulate of Augustus and its ingress being mentioned directly after [m]. The Isia, according to the Egyptian rule, B. C. 28, would actually be in course Nov. 14—17: and it is very probable that these were meant in the present instance.

* Dio dates this swarm loc. cit. Ἐν τοῖς Ἀσκληπιείοις: but what day he intended by that designation does not appear. The Kalends of January, after a certain time, were the holiday of Æsculapius at Rome: cf. Supra, Vol. ii. 105. xvi.

In the Constantian calendar, we have the Natale Æsclepi or Æsculapii iii Idus Septembres: and inscriptions testify to the Natale Collegii Æsculapii at Rome on the 6th of November. Neither of these days could have been intended by Dio here.

As to swarms of bees late in the autumnal quarter, or even in winter; Dio mentions another case of the same kind, liv. 33. 32, U. C. 743 B. C. 11: after the beginning of winter, when Drusus was engaged in military operations on the river Visurgis in Germany. Livy, xxi. 46, mentions a swarm of bees in the Roman Prætorium, just before the battle of the Ticinus, B. C. 218: i. e. as it might be demonstrated, at the end of October at least.

† Cf. xl. 47.

[g] xlvii. 2.
[h] xlvi. 55, 56: cf. xlvii. 1—12.
[i] Supra, Vol. ii. 126. vi.
[k] Dio, lii. 42 1—41: liii. 1.
[l] Ibid. liii. 2.
[m] Ibid.

iv. Lastly, Augustus, as he relates[n], was in Sicily U. C. 733, B. C. 21, until the appointment of the second consul of the year, (M. Lollius) Q. Lepidus[o]; which took place later than usual. And at this time Agrippa was recalled from the east[p]; and married to Julia[q]: and then sent to Rome to take the direction of affairs at home, while Augustus proceeded to Greece. This marriage however having been celebrated in Sicily only after the return of Agrippa from Asia, it was probably celebrated late in the summer. Augustus himself, who left Sicily to continue his journey to Asia when Agrippa returned thence to Rome, did not actually proceed to Asia until the spring[r] B. C. 20. The birth of Caius, Agrippa's eldest son by Julia, the next year[s], confirms this inference. It is probable therefore that he did not actually arrive at Rome before the month of October, B. C. 21: and immediately after his arrival the Ἱερὰ Αἰγύπτια are again alluded to[t], as again in the course of celebration in the city. Nab. 728 B. C. 21 the Isia would be so, Nov. 12—15.

These examples serve to prove that after the suppression of the Roman Sacrum in honour of Isis, and on the 2d of January Roman, her rites were celebrated at Rome according to the Egyptian rule; and the days observed for that purpose were borrowed from the Egyptian calendar. We shewed too in our former work[u] that even the Roman Isia, properly so called, October 28—31, were taken from their proper date in the Egyptian calendar, A. D. 41. We may infer then that what was done in every other instance of this kind would be done in the first of all; and therefore that the Roman date of the Sacrum, iv Non. Januarias U. C. 666, must have been fixed upon for that purpose because it coincided with one of the stated days of the Isia in the Egyptian calendar of the time being; the only one which the Romans could transfer with propriety to their own: Athyr 20 Nab. 660. And that if true is a very decisive proof of the truth of our Roman calendar, U. C. 666.

[n] Ibid. liv. 6. 1.
[o] liv. 7.
[p] Cf. liii. 32. 30 B. C. 23. Velleius Pat. ii. 93.
[q] liv. 6. 11.
[r] Ibid. 7.
[s] Ibid. 8: cf. 6. Also our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. i. 493: iii. 363. 384: iv. 8: and the Cenotaphium Pisanum.
[t] liv. 6.
[u] Fasti Catholici, ii. 453.

iii. *On the date of the incident in the theatre at Pergamus B. C. 88.*

It is recorded by Plutarch[w] of this consular year, U. C. 666, that something occurred in the theatre at Pergamus, when Mithridates was there, which is calculated to illustrate not only our Roman calendar, B. C. 88, but our Macedo-Hellenic one[x] also.

Sulla did not set out from Italy this year to assume the command in the war with Mithridates until the comitia of the year had been held and the consuls of the next year had been appointed: Consulibus ordinatis in futurum annum Cn. Octavio et L. Cornelio Cinna ad Asiam profectus est[y]. These were the consuls of U. C. 667 B. C. 87. And though the confusion of the times was such that the comitia of U. C. 666 could scarcely have been held in all respects conformably to rule; yet, if they were over *de facto* before the time when Sulla actually set out to cross the sea, they could not have been held later than the month of September B. C. 88.

Now according to Plutarch[w] at the very time when Sulla was thus crossing the sea Mithridates was at Pergamus: Ὑπὸ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας ἐν αἷς ὁ Σύλλας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐκίνει τὸν στόλον. And while he was still there, on some occasion when both he and the people were assembled in the theatre, in order to pay him a compliment, and to flatter his hopes of success in the war on which he had just embarked, they had prepared an image of Victory, (as we understand Plutarch's description of the scene,) with a chaplet or crown on its head; which by means of some mechanical contrivance it was to have taken off itself and to have put on the head of the king: instead whereof, through some failure in the apparatus contrived for the purpose or some mismanagement which has not been explained, it happened that the image fell to pieces· Ὅσον οὔπω τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιψαύουσαν,...καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἐκπεσόντα κατὰ τοῦ θεάτρου φέρεσθαι χάμαζε διαθρυπτόμενον, ὥστε φρίκην μὲν τῷ δήμῳ ἀθυμίαν δὲ πολλὴν Μιθριδάτῃ παρασχεῖν.

We consider it extremely probable (in fact almost morally

[w] Sulla, xi. [x] Cf. Fasti Catholici, i. 598. Diss. vii. ch. v. sect. iii.
[y] Eutropius, v. 3. Cf. Livy, lxxvii. Dio, cxvii. 2.

certain) that this incident must have happened on the new year's day at Pergamus, which was one of the times of a public meeting in the theatre; as we may perhaps have an opportunity of shewing more fully hereafter*. Now the new year's day at Pergamus, by the Macedo-Hellenic lunar calendar of the time, Period iii. 67 B. C. 88, was Sept. 22; only two or three days before the autumnal equinox: at which time or just before it Sulla might well have been crossing the sea from Italy to Greece.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 3. 378 *days.*

U. C. 668 Varr. U. C. 667 Cap. U. C. 665 Polyb. B. C. 87–86.

L. Cornelius Cinna ii
C. Marius vii.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 4 B. C. 87. Nundinal Char. 2.

i. *On the date of the death of Marius.*

The first event of this year was the death of Marius, soon after the ingress of his seventh consulate, the Kalends of January U. C. 668 Dec. 4 B. C. 87: on which day Sextus Licinius was thrown by his orders down the Tarpeian rock[z].

He died, according to Velleius Paterculus[a], Initio consulatus: according to Appian[b], Τοῦ πρώτου μηνός: according to Plutarch[c], Ἡμέρας ἑπτακαίδεκα τῆς ἑβδόμης ὑπατείας ἐπιλαβών, January 17 Roman: according to the Epitome of Livy[d], and Florus, Idibus Januariis, January 13 Roman; the former December 20 B. C. 87 the latter December 16.

It is singular that there should be such a difference of statement respecting the date of an event which was likely to be so well known and remembered as this. We will observe only that, as the character of the year was 2, January 10 and 18 (Roman) were both Nundinal. Now from what Plutarch[z]

* Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangements of an Harmony of the Gospels, iv. 153 note. App. Diss. xix.

[z] Livy, lxxx. Plutarch, Marius, xlv. Dio, cxx.
[a] ii. 23. Cf. Orosius, v. 19.
[b] B. C. i. 75.
[c] Marius, xlvi.
[d] lxxx. Florus, iii. 21, 17.

has left on record it may be inferred either that the last illness of Marius continued seven days, or that the same seven days of his life not long before his death were passed in a constant carousal, a continued indulgence in the pleasures of the table. The former appears to be what he really intended to say: for he tells us himself that Marius died of a pleurisy (Νόσος πλευρῖτις); and that according to the historian Piso (a contemporary) he was seven days confined to his bed, before his death. Velleius Paterculus also implies that he sank at last under some illness or other, *morbo oppressus;* and Plutarch has left it on record that Posidonius of Rhodes[e] had an interview with him on public business, while he was lying ill on this last occasion. There can be no doubt then that his death was preceded by an illness, and of greater or less duration.

And yet it may be inferred from Plutarch himself[f] that even this illness was brought on by his giving himself up Εἰς ποτοὺς καὶ μεθὰς ἀώρους; the object of which was to drown the uneasiness which he could not but feel under the thought of the return of Sulla, and of the contest which he should have to wage with him at last. He might have adopted this new course of life on the 3rd of January Roman, the day after the Nundinal day, (the 2nd,) and might have persisted in it seven days; and his last illness in that case must have seized him on the tenth of the month, and have carried him off on the fourth day after, if he really died on the Ides, or, (as we are much more inclined to believe,) on the *eighth* day after; the 17th of January Roman, December 20 Julian B. C. 87*.

* The proscriptions which ensued on the return of Marius to Rome, at the beginning of the year, according to Florus (iii. 21, 17) came between the Kalends and the Ides of January; and according to Dio, (Fr. cxix. 2) they lasted five *days* and five *nights*. The mention of *nights* as well as *days* in connection with this fact is probably significant. The moon was at the full Dec. 20 B. C. 87, Jan. 17 Roman U. C. 668. If these proscriptions began *five* days before the Ides, (i. e. on Jan. 8 Roman,) they began Dec. 11 Julian; i. e. in the second quarter of this moon: at a time consequently when there would be more and more light every night up to the full. Perhaps the origin of the misstatement of the Epitomator of

[e] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, ii. 452 note. [f] Vita, xlv. Cf. Orosius, v. 19.

ii. *On the date of the capture of Athens by* Sulla.

The next event of this consular year, which is calculated to illustrate and confirm our calendar, is that of the capture of Athens by Sulla.

Concerning the year of this event there can be no question[f]. Sulla indeed, as we have seen, must have set out on his expedition to Greece in B. C. 88, and not long before Sept. 22 that year. But the siege of Athens could not have begun before the spring of B. C. 87. It is reckoned by Appian[g] not quite *three* years from the time when Sulla assumed the command in Greece and began offensive operations there by laying siege to Athens, down to that of the pacification concluded between him and Mithridates: and, as that was certainly not much earlier than the spring of B. C. 84, these three years preceding it cannot be reckoned from a later point of time than the spring, B. C. 87. And in this statement he is virtually confirmed by Velleius Paterculus[h].

The siege then having been begun in the spring of B. C. 87[i], the first winter mentioned after its commencement[k] must have been that of B. C. 87–86. And this also was the time when Lucullus was despatched by Sulla to raise a fleet of ships at Alexandria in Egypt[k], or elsewhere. This mission of Lucullus is dated by Plutarch[l] Ἐν ἀκμῇ χειμῶνος: and it appears from the context of his narrative that, while he was engaged upon it, Sulla and the army were encamped *sub pellibus* under the walls of Athens. This too must have been the time and the occasion at which and on which Lucullus, at the request of the people of Cyrene, legislated for them; i. e. gave them a constitution[m]: B. C. 87–86. Nor did he actually join Sulla again until the latter was preparing to pass into Asia[n]: and meanwhile mention is made

Livy, that Marius died on the Ides, might be this fact; that the proscriptions *terminated* on the Ides: for it might be supposed that they could have been stopped for the time only by the death of Marius himself.

[f] Cf. Livy, lxxx–lxxxiii. Vell. Pat. ii. 17–19. 23.
[g] B. C. i. 76. 75.
[h] ii. 24.
[i] Appian, Mithridatica, 30.
[k] Ibid. 33.
[l] Lucullus, ii. Cf. Cicero, Academica, iv. 1, 1: 4, 1.
[m] Lucullus, ii. Cf. Josephus, Ant. Jud. xiv. vii. 2. Also our Prolegomena, pag. 156. cap. iii.
[n] Appian, Mithridatica, 51. 56. Plutarch, Lucullus, iii. iv. Sulla, xxiv.

of another winter, passed by Sulla in Thessaly[n]; which must have been that of B. C. 86–85: it is noticed also in the account of the proceedings of Lucullus while he was absent; and that too must determine it to B. C. 86–85. Athens had been taken before even the former of those allusions to that season of the year in particular appears[o]. There can be no doubt then that the year of its capture must have been B. C. 86.

Now the Roman date of the day of the month on which it was taken has been preserved by Plutarch, from the memoirs or commentaries (Ὑπομνήματα) of Sulla himself*: Ἑλεῖν δὲ τὰς Ἀθήνας αὐτός φησιν ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι Μαρτίαις Καλάνδαις, ἥτις ἡμέρα συμπίπτει μάλιστα τῇ νουμηνίᾳ τοῦ Ἀνθεστηριῶνος μηνός· ἐν ᾧ κατὰ τύχην ὑπομνήματα πολλὰ τοῦ διὰ τὴν ἐπομβρίαν ὀλέθρου καὶ τῆς φθορᾶς ἐκείνης δρῶσιν, ὡς τότε καὶ περὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον μάλιστα τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ συμπεσόντος[p].

It would be a mistake to infer from this passage that the Kalends of the Roman March and the first of the Attic Anthesterion coincided on this occasion; or had been historically recorded to have done so. No such coincidence is asserted by it. A *general* agreement between the Kalends of March and the first of Anthesterion it does indeed assert; but we hope to shew hereafter that this is to be explained by the state of the case in Plutarch's time, and by the relation prevailing *de facto* between the first of the Roman March and the first of the Attic Anthesterion, when he was writing.

The observation, subjoined on the coincidence between this capture of Athens by Sulla on the Kalends of March and the ceremonies still kept up at Athens in the month Anthesterion in memory of the flood of Deucalion, might appear at first sight to be very irrelevant to the occasion itself which produced it. For what connection would there seem to have

* In xxii books, cf. Sulla, xiv. xvii. xxxvii. They were addressed to Lucullus, (Lucullus, i. iv. xxiii): and were finished only two days before the death of Sulla himself (Sulla, xxxvii): and yet according to Suetonius (De Illustribus Grammaticis, xii. 2) the last book was completed by Cornelius Epicedius, a freedman of Sulla's.

[n] Appian, &c. loc. cit.
[o] Appian, Mithridatica, 30–39. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla, xii–xiv: xv–xxi: De Garrulitate, vii. Velleius Pat. ii. 23. Florus, iii. 5, 9. 10. A. Gellius, xv. 1. Eutropius, v. 4. Orosius, vi. 2. Suidas, Γεφυρίζων.
[p] Sulla, xiv.

been between the days or the ceremonies observed at Athens in memory of *that* flood, and *this* capture of Athens by Sulla? But the truth is, the observation had a meaning; and, for the illustration both of the Roman and of the Attic calendar of the time, a very important meaning.

These days in the Attic month Anthesterion, devoted to the commemoration of the catastrophe in question, were the Μιαραὶ ἡμέραι, of which we have already given a sufficient account[q]. They were seven in number; and their stated date in the calendar was from the 13th of Anthesterion inclusive to the 19th inclusive. Now, by a remarkable coincidence, the Kalends of March U. C. 668 in the Roman calendar, and the second of these Μιαραὶ ἡμέραι the 14th of Anthesterion in the Attic calendar, (Period v. 42,) both met together in the Julian February 22 B. C. 86. This was a striking coïncidence. The capture of Athens on *that* day, followed by such serious consequences to the city and its inhabitants, (on the second and probably the worst of these detestable days, the first at least after the annual festivity of the Anthesteria, including the Χόες and the Χύτροι,) could not fail to make it appear so; and to fix it in the memory of the Athenians, and to cause it to be carefully handed down to posterity.

But even this is not the sum total of the coincidence. It may be collected from Plutarch's account of the circumstances which preceded the capture[r] that both the night before, and the night after, the Roman day of the capture, the Kalends of March, were moonlight: Αὐτὸς δὲ Σύλλας τὸ μεταξὺ τῆς Πειραϊκῆς πύλης καὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς κατασκάψας καὶ συνομαλύνας περὶ μέσας νύκτας ἐσήλαυνε φρικώδης: and this being the prelude of all which followed, (the sack of the city and the massacre of the inhabitants,) it is properly the actual date of the capture: the first of the Roman March, U. C. 668, reckoned according to the Roman rule from midnight.

The time thus selected for the actual occupation of the city and the commencement of the work of destruction is remarkable: and though Plutarch has not explained it, our calendars (both the Attic and the Roman) are competent to

[q] Diss. iv. ch. i. sect. xiii. Vol. i. 424 note. [r] xiv.

do so. The 14th of Anthesterion dated from midnight, in the original scheme of the Metonic calendar, when it was true to the moon, it is evident must have coincided with the full of the moon; but, at this period in the history of the Metonic correction at Athens, it was in reality five or six days in excess of the moon: and the 14th of Anthesterion, instead of coinciding with the lunar 14th at this time, was in reality coinciding with the lunar 19th or 20th. The moon was actually new Feb. 3 at 0.30 A. M. Paris, B. C. 86; and therefore 19 days old exactly at midnight Feb. 22, Anthesterion 14, March 1 Roman, this year. It would consequently rise somewhat before midnight; certainly not later than midnight, Feb. 22. It is manifest therefore that, in making choice of midnight for the actual invasion of the city, Sulla was purposely fixing on a time when he would have the advantage of moonlight for the rest of the night. And it must be admitted that this coincidence is a great confirmation of both our calendars.

Aristio the tyrant of Athens, under whom it had maintained so long and obstinate a resistance, (from the spring of B. C. 87 to this time B. C. 86,) on the capture of the rest of the city took refuge in the Acropolis; and Sulla's legate, Curio, was left to besiege him there, while Sulla himself, soon after the capture, marched to Bœotia, to encounter Taxilas and Archelaus the generals of Mithridates. Plutarch says he held out in that situation Χρόνον . . συχνόν[s]; and that he was compelled to surrender himself at last only from want of water: and yet so critically before a change of the weather that, on the very day and almost at the very hour when Curio brought him down from the citadel as a prisoner, there came on a copious shower of rain which would have relieved his preexisting necessity. The precise time of this surrender is left to conjecture. For the climate of Attica however it is manifest that there might have been a continuance of dry weather in April or May, and yet there might be an accidental fall of rain too *.

* It is worth while to compare with the above account of the capture of Athens according to our other authorities that of Pausanias in particular,

[s] Sulla, xiv. xxiii. Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, 38, 39. Dio, cxxiv: cxxi: clxxiii. 2.

SECTION III.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 5. 355 *days.*

U. C. 670 Varr. 669 Cap. 667 Polyb. B. C. 85—84.

Cn. Papirius Carbo ii
L. Cornelius Cinna iv.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 28 B. C. 85. Nundinal Char. 7.

On the date of the Comitia Consuli subrogando, *U. C.* 670.

This year was the second of those two, U. C. 669 and U. C. 670, for which Cinna and Carbo continued themselves in possession of the consulate[t].

Cinna however was killed in a mutiny of his soldiers early in the spring of this year; and the comitia *Consuli subrogando,* proposed by Carbo, having been twice interrupted, (and on the second occasion by the fall of a thunderbolt Ἐς τὸ τῆς Σελήνης καὶ τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν,) Appian tells us[u] it was ordered by the soothsayers that the election of a successor to Cinna should be postponed until after the summer solstice; Ὑπὲρ τὰς θερινὰς τροπὰς ἀπετίθεντο τὰς χειροτονίας: the consequence of which was that no successor was appointed at all: Consulatum Carbo solus gessit[w].

i. xx. 4. According to him it was taken on the same day on which Sulla's victory over Taxilas was won: so much so that Τρίτῃ (δὲ) ὕστερον ἡμέρᾳ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἦλθον ἐπ' ἀμφότερα τὰ στρατόπεδα ἄγγελοι, Σύλλα μὲν ὡς Ἀθηναίοις ἑᾖ τεῖχος ἐαλωκὸς, τοῖς δὲ Ἀθήνας πολιορκήσασι Τάξιλον κεκρατῆσθαι μάχῃ περὶ Χαιρωνείαν. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla, xv—xxi. Appian, Mithridatica, 40—45. Velleius Pat. ii. 23. Eutropius, v. 4. Orosius, vi. 2. Photius, Codex 224. p. 231. l. 24—38. If any such coincidence really happened, it must have been *this;* viz. that the news of the capture of the Acropolis was received at the same time in Bœotia as that of the battle at Athens. Pausanias is so far consistent with himself as to suppose that Sulla returned to Athens, after he received this news of its being taken; and *then* treated it in the manner in which he was known to have done, as a conquered city: putting every tenth man in it to death. And among those so treated he includes Aristio, whom he represents as having previously taken refuge in the temple of Minerva, i. xx. *ad fin.* And yet, according to our other accounts, Aristio was put to death two years afterwards, and even then was made away with by poison.

[t] Livy, lxxxiii. Appian, B. C. i. 75. 77. 82. [u] i. 78. [w] Livy, lxxxiii. Velleius Pat. ii. 24.

The term or προθεσμία prescribed, for the suspension of the comitia meanwhile and for their consummation at last, is remarkable. The question is first What we are to suppose was intended in this instance by the summer solstice? The mean summer solstice at this time was falling on June 24; and the true on June 25. But these soothsayers were no doubt Etrurians; and the Etrurians, as we have seen[x], had a tropical sphere of their own, in which these natural terms, the vernal equinox, the summer solstice, and the other two, were defined by a peculiar rule: and were laid down in the eleventh degrees of the sphere of Mazzaroth, or fixed sphere, peculiar to them also. The prodigy which had just occurred, to interrupt the comitia in the second instance, was one which directly concerned the principles of their own science, (the interpretation of portents in which the instrumental means were such things as thunder or lightning). It has been seen, from the testimony of Cato De Re Rustica[y], that the original divisions of the tropical sphere of the Etrurians in the fixed sphere were still recognized even in his time; only that they were then falling one day earlier than they had done at first: the vernal equinox on April 3, the summer solstice on July 4, and the other two in the same proportion. In our opinion the only summer solstitial term which the Etrurian soothsayers, in a case like this, could be supposed to have had in view, would be July 4; and we shall probably best explain their direction, if we may suppose that the comitia when interrupted on the second occasion, and by the fall of lightning in question, were going on upon April 4: the day after the stated date of the vernal equinox in the Etrurian sphere of this time April 3: and that the soothsayers took occasion from that coincidence, and from the suspension to which the comitia necessarily became liable on that account only, to order that they should not be resumed and completed until the same time after the summer solstice: that is, until the day after July 4, July 5. Consequently that they should be suspended and kept in abeyance just one quarter of the year, according to their own division of the sphere: and then be resumed and completed, as if they had never been inter-

[x] Diss. xi. ch. v. sect. viii. Vol. ii. 492. [y] Diss. xv. ch. i. sect. iii. supra, p. 196.

rupted. This appears to us to be the true explanation of their answer; and it must be admitted to be such as would be entirely consistent with the principles of their system. April 4 B. C. 84 corresponded to iv Idus Apriles U. C. 670; and July 5 to iii Idus Quinctiles.

SECTION IV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 6. 378 *days.*

U. C. 671 Varr. 670 Cap. 668 Polyb. B. C. 84-83.

L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus
C. Norbanus.

Kalendæ Januariæ December 18 B. C. 84. Nundinal Char. 4.

i. *On the date of the return of* Sulla, *and of the burning of the Capitol,* U. C. 671.

We have already observed[z] that, between the commencement of the siege of Athens B. C. 87 and the march of Sulla into Asia, there was evidence in the contemporary accounts of *two* winters; one that of B. C. 87–86, the other that of B. C. 86–85. The year then of his march into Asia must have been B. C. 85. It appears from Appian and Livy[a] that B. C. 85 he was employed in Thrace, against the barbarians there. Tacitus incidentally supplies the proof of another winter[b]; which must have been passed in Asia[c], and must have been that of B. C. 85–84. And after this winter he was some time at Ephesus in Asia Minor[d]; and from Ephesus he put to sea at last on his return to Italy[d]: sailing first of all to the Piræus at Athens; where he arrived in three days' time. That this was in B. C. 84, and before the stated date of the mysteries that year, (that is before the end of September,) we may possibly have an opportunity of shewing more at large on a future occasion. Sulla was initiated at these mysteries; and he was still at Athens as late as the Dionysia also next in course[e]: that is, as February or March, B. C. 83.

[z] Supra, 281.

[a] Appian, Mithridatica, 51: 55: 56. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla, xxii: xxiii. Dio, Fragm. clxxiii. 2. Livy, lxxxiii.

[b] Annales, iv. 56: cf. 46: also Photius, Cod. 224. p. 231. l. 14. From Memnon of Heraclea.

[c] Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, 56. Plutarch, Sulla, xxiv: xxv.

[d] Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, 61: Plutarch, Sulla, xxvi: cf. Suidas, Σύλλας.

[e] Plutarch, Sulla, xxvi: cf. also Cornelius Nepos's Life of Atticus, who was at Athens with Sulla on this occasion.

It follows that he could not have returned to Italy before the spring or the summer of B.C. 83, in the consular year of Scipio and Norbanus[f]; and from the anecdote recorded by Plutarch[g] it may be inferred that the actual day when he landed in Italy could not in any case long have preceded that of the conflagration of the Capitol at Rome. In fact, if Plutarch is to be believed[h], the incident to which he alludes, when Sulla was now at Tarentum, not long after his landing[h], must have happened only on the very day on which the Capitol also was burnt to the ground[i]: which day, as he informs us[g], was Πρὸ μιᾶς Νόνων Κϋϊντιλίων, Pridie Nonas Quinctiles, this year; Quinctilis 6 Roman U. C. 671 July 11 B. C. 83.

ii. *On the dates which occur in Cicero's Oration* Pro P. Quinctio.

This year too will probably possess an additional importance in the opinion of the classical student, because it is that to which the first oration publicly delivered by Cicero virtually belongs; the oration Pro Publio Quinctio[k]. The oration itself was delivered two years later; U. C. 673, B. C. 82—81, the consular year of M. Tullius Decula and Cn. Cornelius Dolabella, when Cicero was in the 26th year of his age. But the case which is argued in it belongs to this year. It is of use for our proper purpose, the verification of this period of the Irregular calendar; because it ascertains the year in which it was delivered to have been intercalary[l], and the seat of the intercalation to have been the usual one, Postridie Terminalia, and the length of the Merkedonius to have been 28 days. In order to make this appear we shall perhaps be excused if we enter on the consideration of the chronology of this speech, as much in detail as may be necessary.

[f] Appian, B. C. i. 82: 84: 79. Plutarch, Sulla, xxvii: xxviii. Livy, lxxxiv: lxxxv. Velleius Pat. ii. 25. Florus, iii. 21, 18. Orosius, v. 20. Eutropius, v. 5.

[g] Sulla, xxvii.

[h] Cf. Augustin, De Civitate, ii. 24: who says it was the day before.

[i] Appian, B. C. i. 82: 84: 86. Obsequens, cxviii. Dionysius Hal. iv. 62. Tacitus, Histor. iii. 72. Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 5. 19. Cicero, xxi. In Catilinam, iii. 4, 9. Sallust, De Bello Catilin. 48. Plutarch, Poplicola, xv. Solinus, ii. 17. Cassiodorius, in Anno. Cf. Livy, vi. 4.

[k] A. Gellius, xv. 28.

[l] Cf. Diss. vi. ch. i. sect. v. Vol. i. 516.

The dates which occur in it in *terms*, as the classical reader must be aware, are first ii Kalendas Februarias (Pridie Kalendas Februarias[m]) Scipione et Norbano Coss. January 15 (Julian) B. C. 83; on which day Quinctius left Rome to go to Gaul. Secondly, the Nonæ Februariæ[n], January 20, the same year; on which day it was pretended by Nævius that he had entered into recognizances for his appearance in court, at a stated time, which recognizances he had not kept. Thirdly, the v Kalendas Interkalares[o]; i. e. if the Kalendæ Interkalares were Postridie Terminalia, (February 24 Roman,) February 20 Roman, February 4 Julian B. C. 83: on which day Nævius obtained the decree of the Prætor Burrienus, which authorized him to take possession of the goods and chattels of Quinctius at Rome. Fourthly, Pridie Kalendas Interkalares[p], February 7, when P. Quinctius was ousted De fundo or saltu communi in Gaul as Cicero terms it; *biduo* aut ad summum *triduo*[p] after the decree of possession had been obtained at Rome. Lastly, the Ides of September[q], the same year, September 16 B. C. 83; when the cause was to have come on for a final hearing: though it was actually deferred for a year and six months afterwards[r].

The first observation which we may make on these dates is that none of them appears to have been Nundinal; in particular neither of the two *dies fasti* or court-days, v Kalendas Interkalares, February 20 Roman, and the Ides of September September 13 Roman.

In the next place it appears from the oration itself, that a friend of Nævius', L. Publicius, returning from Gaul, had fallen in with P. Quinctius, on his way to Gaul, at the Vada Volaterrana; of which meeting he informed Nævius as soon as he got to Rome: and to this information all the subsequent proceedings of Nævius at Rome to the prejudice of Cicero's client are attributed. Now the Vada Volaterrana were 25 × 6 (150) Roman miles from Rome direct. It may be collected from the oration Pro S. Roscio[s] that it was at least *four* days' journey *express* to this quarter from Rome; and therefore eight days' journey at least, at the rate of 20

[m] Cap. 6, 24: 18, 57. [n] Ibid. [q] Ibid. 7, 29. Cf. the Argumentum also. [r] Ibid. 8, 30.
[o] Ibid. 25, 79.
[p] Ibid. [s] Cap. 7, 19, 20: 36, 105: 37, 105.

miles a day. We may assume then that Quinctius and Publicius must have met at these Vada on or about February 7 Roman, January 22 B.C. 83; and that Publicius arrived at Rome, after that meeting, on or about February 15 Roman, January 30.

It appears further from the oration that after the coming of Publicius to Rome, and in consequence of the piece of news relating to Quinctius which Nævius received from him, the latter Pueros circum amicos dimisit ..... ut ad tabulam Sextiam sibi adsint hora secunda postridie. Veniunt, it is added, frequentes. testificatur ipse P. Quinctium non stetisse et se stetisse[t]: the next step to which of course was the application to the Prætor De bonis possidundis. And as the actual date of the decree so obtained was v Kalendas Interkalares February 20 Roman; the only question will be whether those preliminary proceedings took place the day before the issuing of the edict, February 19 Roman, or the day after the arrival of Publicius, February 16 Roman. The reason of the thing would require us to decide this question in favour of the latter; for Nævius would lose no time in acting upon the information which he had received from Publicius*: and Publicius would lose no time in making Nævius acquainted with it. This conclusion may be confirmed by taking into account the character of the days in the Roman month of February; according to those distinctions which we explained elsewhere[u]. In the Julian calendar[w] every day in this month from the Kalends to xiv Kalendas Martias (1–16) appears to have been Nefastus (i. e. out *of term, vacation,* in opposition to a dies Fastus, a court-day, a day in term); and the xiv Kal. Martias, the 16th of the month, was intercisus, partly out of term, and partly in term: so that if Publicius arrived on the 15th, there might still have been time for applying to the Prætor on the next day; of which Nævius

* Especially if, as it may be collected from 26, 81, he had already taken measures to have Quinctius ousted De fundo communi in Gaul, on the 23rd of February Roman.

t Cap. 6, 25: cf. 16, 53.

u Diss. vii. ch iii. sect. i. Vol. i. 51.

w Maffæan, apud Foggini.

might avail himself if he thought proper *. Again, every day in February, from the 16th to the 20th, in the Julian calendar, was either Nefastus or Comitialis; and a day of either kind strictly speaking would be equally opposed to a dies Fastus. But at this time, and before the Julian correction of the calendar, if Burrienus' decree was passed on the 20th, that must have been a dies Fastus; for to issue such a decree on any day was to do the very thing on that day the right of doing which on a particular day made it Fastus: Dare, Dicere, Addicere. And as the 21st of February was the calendar date of the Feralia [x]; it would be an additional argument that the 20th must have been Fastus, that the 21st could not possibly be so. It follows then, as we have concluded, that Nævius must have got the decree from the Prætor on the 20th; and must have appeared before him first on the 16th: and must have had his information from Publicius on the 15th.

It follows too, on the same principle, that the v Kalendas Interkalares, agreeably to the Roman idiom in such cases, is rightly understood of February 20 Roman; and therefore that the first day of the intercalary month was February 24: and consequently that the seat of the Merkedonius was the usual one, Postridie Terminalia. And with respect to its length; it appears from the oration that Nævius, having thus obtained possession of the goods of Quinctius at Rome on the 20th of February Roman, kept possession of them *ex edicto* 30 days [y]; when Sex. Alphenus, the procurator of Quinctius, ousted him again. And though it is not distinctly stated in the oration that Alphenus had just before that arrived from Gaul, (where Quinctius, as Nævius pretended, and indeed by his contrivance, had already been ejected De communi fundo so long before as Pridie Kalendas Interkalares, February 23 Roman,) yet it may be collected even from the oration that he must have done so, and it is clearly asserted in the argument prefixed that he had.

* And here it would be an obvious inference that if Nævius fixed with his friends to meet him on a dies intercisus, at the 2d hour of the day, it was Fastus from the 2d hour; Nefastus before it only.

[x] See Vol. i. 427 note.

[y] Cap. 8, 30: cf. 26, 82: and the Argument. Also, 19, 61.

Now this *Fundus communis* was 700 Roman miles distant from Rome, In Sebusianis: and that would require 29 days' journey at the rate of 24 miles a day, though it might be accomplished in 26 at the rate of 27 miles a day. We may presume then that Alphenus was dispatched from Gaul on the Kalends of the Merkedonius, Feb. 24 Roman, the day after the ejectment; and if Nævius had been 30 days in possession of Quinctius' goods at Rome, when he arrived, he must have arrived on the 27th of the Merkedonius: that is in 27 days' time. For Nævius had been put in possession on the 20th of February Roman. Reckon then 30 days from Feb. 20, and you come to the 27th of the Merkedonius. The Merkedonius therefore this year had not less than 27 days; but that would not prove that it might not in reality have had 28. In all probability Nævius was ousted again on the last day of the Merkedonius; which on this principle must have been Fastus. From that time to the Ides of September the argument reckons six or seven months; and that would be strictly correct, dated from the Kalends of March.

SECTION V.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 7. 355 *days.*

U. C. 672 Varr. 671 Cap. 669 Polyb. B. C. 83–82.

C. Marius
Cn. Papirius Carbo iii.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 31 B. C. 83. Nundinal Char. 2.

i. *On the date of the battle between* Sulla *and* Pontius Telesinus Ad Portam Collinam *at Rome.*

The ingress of this year is mentioned by Appian[z], and in connection with it the time of the year at which it fell out, and the character of the season: Τοῦ δ' ἐπιόντος ἔτους ὕπατοι μὲν ἐγενέσθην Παπίριός τε Κάρβων αὖθις καὶ Μάριος ὁ ἀδελφιδοῦς Μαρίου τοῦ περιφανοῦς.....χειμὼν δὲ καὶ κρύος πολὺ γενόμενον ἅπαντας ἀλλήλων διέστησε: so that military operations on both sides were necessarily suspended until the spring: Ἀρχομένου δ' ἦρος, κ', τ. λ.

[z] B. C. i. 87. Cf. Plutarch, Sulla, xxviii. Livy, lxxxvi—lxxxviii. Vell. Pat. ii. 26. Valerius Max. vii. vi. 4 De Necessitate: vi. ii. 8 De Libere dictis: v. iii. 5 De Ingratitudine: ix. xiii. 2 De Cupiditate vitæ. Florus, iii. 21, 20. Eutropius, v. 5, 6.

Our calendar explains this. The Kalends of January U. C. 672 fell on Dec. 31 B. C. 83, seven days after the winter solstice, Dec. 24, and only four days before the full moon Jan. 4 B. C. 82; which is abundantly sufficient to account for the severity of the weather at the time.

A date which belongs to this year has been preserved by Pliny; though no use can be made of it for the illustration of the calendar. C. Mario Cn. Carbone iii. Coss. a. d. quintum Kalendas Junias M. Cæcilius Rufus et C. Licinius Calvus eadem die geniti sunt; oratores quidem ambo sed tam dispari eventu[a]. The day thus specified was May 24 B. C. 82.

But the most important event of the year for *our* purpose was that of the battle at the Porta Collina of Rome, between Sulla and the Samnites under Pontius Telesinus; in which even he was so nearly defeated. It is agreed that this battle began at the ninth or tenth hour of the day, and that it lasted until a late hour at night[b]. A battle fought under such circumstances must have been fought by moonlight; and the moon itself at the time must have been at the full, or near it.

Now both the year of this event, and the day of the month on which it happened, are upon record in Velleius Paterculus[c]. At Pontius Telesinus dux Samnitium, vir domi bellique fortissimus penitusque Romano nomini infestissimus, contractis circiter quadraginta millibus fortissimæ pertinacissimæque in retinendis armis juventutis, Carbone et Mario Coss.....Kal. Novembris ita ad portam Collinam cum Sulla dimicavit ut ad summum discrimen et eum et rempublicam perduceret.

The Kalends of November, U. C. 672, according to our calendar fell on October 24; and there was an eclipse of the moon October 27 6 P. M. Paris B. C. 82: so that on the day of the battle this moon wanted only three days of being at the full. Velleius proceeds: Felicitatem diei quo Samnitium Telesinique pulsus est exercitus Sulla perpetua ludorum Circensium honoravit memoria, quibus sine nomine Sullanæ victoriæ celebrantur. That is games were founded by Sulla

[a] H. N. vii. 50. 227. Cf. xxvii. 2. p. 3.

[b] Appian, B. C. i. 92, 93. Plutarch, Sulla, xxix. xxx. Livy, lxxxviii. Dio, Fr. cxxxv. 1, 2. Strabo, v. 4. Florus, iii. 21, 23, 24. Lucan, Pharsalia, ii. 134, and Scholia. Orosius, v. 20.

[c] ii. 27.

in commemoration of this victory [c]. The Ludi Victoriæ are meant. And games of that denomination appear in the Maffæan calendar, attached to vi Kalendas Novembres, Oct. 27; but none on the Kalends of November: for which reason, the learned Lipsius has proposed to correct the text of Velleius by reading vi Kal. Nov. for the Kalends of November. But there is no authority on critical grounds for any such correction. The genuineness of the present reading is confirmed by the coincidence which has just been pointed out of the age of the moon at the time of the battle. There is however another fragment of the ancient Julian calendar, for the month of November, the Antiatine; in which the note of (*Ludi*) IN CIRCO is legible, attached to the Kalends of November. The word Ludi only is wanting; and even without that addition nothing would seem to correspond better than such an entry to Velleius' description of these games: viz. that, though really instituted in commemoration of the victory of this day, they were celebrated in his time without any mention of it. As to the Ludi Victoriæ, of which this particular day, and its proper solemnity, in after-times appear to have constituted the last; we shall see reason perhaps by and by to conclude that their true date at first was iv Kalendas Novembres, October 29 Roman; not vi Kalendas Novembres, October 27. The games of the Kalends of November would be the fourth day of these; but they lasted six days in all.

ii. *On the Dictatorship, Triumph, and Games of Sulla.*

From the Kalends of November U. C. 672, October 24 B.C. 82, to the end of the year, Pridie Kalendas Januarias December 20, there would be two Roman months complete; and that interval would seem to have been long enough for the transaction of every thing which is still upon record between the battle on the Kalends of November and the end of that consular year [d]. It is generally assumed that the first civil war was decided by this victory of Sulla's under the walls of Rome.

[c] Cf. Asconius, in Orationem in Toga Candida, p. 114. 117.

[d] Appian, B. C. i. 90–97. Plutarch, Sulla, xxxi. xxxii. Dio, cxxxv. 3.—cxxxix.

There is no reason then why the next consular year should not be supposed to have entered at the usual time. We know only that the comitia for the elections against it were held by an interrex[e]; but that would be nothing extraordinary: both the consuls of the existing year having belonged to the opposite party, and both being now dead. We know too, that Sulla having been first of all nominated dictator himself[f], the consuls of the next year, U. C. 673, Tullius Decula and Cornelius Dolabella, were elected under his auspices[g]. This revival of the office of dictator in the person of Sulla Velleius and Plutarch, and as it would seem Appian also[f], (though his text is corrupt in this instance,) represent as 120 years later than the last appointment of the same kind which was upon record in Roman history; and it might truly be so represented, if this last appointment was that of C. Servilius Geminus, in the consular year of Ti. Claudius Nero and M. Servilius Geminus[h] U. C. 552 B. C. 203–202, and this of Sulla took place U. C. 672 B. C. 82.

The triumph of Sulla after this is still on record in the Fasti[i]; not however among the events of U. C. 672 or 673, dated from the Kalends of January, B. C. 82 or 81, but in the year of his second consulate[k] U. C. 674 B. C. 80. That year entered on the Kalends of January January 2 B. C. 80, and the triumph was celebrated *Per Biduum*, iv Kal. Februarias and iii Kal. Februarias, January 28 and 29; by the rule of the Fasti Triumphales[i], still within the limits of U. C. 672 Cap. reckoned from the Palilia, though in U. C. 674 Varr. reckoned from the Kalends of January: and in either case B. C. 80. The character of January U. C. 674 being 5; January 29 Roman (Pridie Kal. Februarias) was Nundinal, but not January 27 (iv Kal. Februarias), and January 28 Roman, iii Kal. Feb., was the day before a Nundinal day. The triumph therefore ended on the day before a Nundinal day.

It follows that the celebration of this triumph (which included all the successes of Sulla, both those of the war with Mithridates and those of the civil war,) must have been pur-

[e] Appian, i. 98.
[f] Ibid. 98, 99. Plutarch, Sulla, xxxiii: Comparatio Sullæ et Lysandri, i. Velleius Pat. ii. 28. Dionysius Hal. v. 77. Cf. 59: 70: 72, 73. Dio, xxxvi. 14.
[g] Appian, i. 100. Livy, lxxxix.
[h] Livy, xxx. 39.
[i] Vol. ii. 90. No. xcvi.
[k] Appian, B. C. i. 103.

posely deferred until *this* year. And that this year for some reason or other was deliberately selected for it and for the other celebrities of Sulla, which took place in the course of it, might always have been inferred from the fact which is upon record with respect to the Olympic games of this year; those of Olympiad clxxv B. C. 80: opposite to which in the Ὀλυμπιάδων Ἀναγραφαὶ[l] we find the entry: Ἄνδρες οὐκ ἠγωνίσαντο, Σύλλα πάντας εἰς Ῥώμην μεταπεμψαμένου.: and more circumstantially in Appian, with reference to the same omission[m]; Οὐδενὸς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τότε ἀγωνίσματος πλὴν σταδίου δρόμου γενομένου. τοὺς γὰρ ἀθλητὰς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα θεάματα πάντα ὁ Σύλλας ἐς Ῥώμην μετεκέκλητο ἐπὶ δόξῃ τῶν Μιθριδατικῶν ἔργων ἢ τῶν Ἰταλικῶν. The same thing occurred again A. D. 65 in the time of Nero; but nothiug like it had ever occurred before.

The regular date of this Olympiad would be July 10—15; from which we may infer that Sulla's games were expected to be celebrated some time in June, but too late in that month to allow any of the candidates at *his* games to return and take part in the Olympic. In fact we collect from Plutarch[n] and Ovid[o] that the actual time of the celebration of these games at Rome must have coincided with that of the dedication of the Ædes of Hercules, Custos Fidius, built by Sulla himself; the date of which was June 4 Roman[p] U. C. 674, June 25 B. C. 80. It is remarkable that *this* was the most proper Olympic date; the date of the first Olympiad of Pelops, B. C. 1260; the date of the first Olympiad in the Metonic calendar of Elis itself, B. C. 432. The character of the Roman June this year was 2; consequently the 4th was not Nundinal. These games would no doubt last several days; probably as long as the Olympic at least, June 25 to June 30. It would not have been possible therefore for any one to have got back to Olympia after them by July 10.

The Ludi Victoriæ too were probably first celebrated this year, October 29 Roman, November 15 Julian; and the character of October being 4, they would begin on that principle on the day after a Nundinal day. The particular games of the Kalends of November at this first institution would be

[l] Anecdota Parisiensia, ii. 150. 1. Eusebii, Chron. Arm. Lat. Pars i. 303.
[m] B. C. i. 99.
[n] Sulla, xxxv.
[o] Fasti, vi. 209—212.
[p] Cf. Vol. ii. 108.

those of the fourth day, i. e. the middle day; for they lasted six days in all.

SECTION VI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 11. 378 days.

U. C. 676 Varr. 675 Cap. 673 Polyb. B. C. 78.

M. Aimilius Lepidus
Q. Lutatius Catulus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 28 B. C. 78. Nundinal Char. 1.

On the Nundinal Incidence U. C. 676 B. C. 78; *and on the general administration of the Calendar in the sixth Irregular Cycle.*

The Nundinal character of this year is known from testimony[q]. The Nundinal incidence so much dreaded by the Romans, notwithstanding all their precautions to the contrary, took place this year. Consequently the Kalends of January were Nundinal, and the character of the year was unity.

We cannot suppose that this would knowingly be allowed to happen; and yet if it was the effect of an oversight it would not be easy to say to what cause that oversight was probably to be attributed. Nothing would have been easier than to prevent this particular form of the incidence U. C. 676, by making the preceding year U. C. 675 a year of 377 days instead of one of 378; by which means the Nundinal character of U. C. 676 would have been rendered 2 instead of 1.

All that we know of the circumstances of this year, and of their possible connection with the administration of the calendar, is that the Pontifex Maximus at this time was Q. Cæcilius Metellus, the father-in-law of Sulla[r]; and that Cæcilia or Metella his daughter, the wife of Sulla, died in U. C. 674 B. C. 80, in the midst of the games and shows which Sulla was celebrating in honour of Hercules[s]: and that the last illness of Sulla himself attacked him the next year, B. C.

[q] Diss. vii. ch. ii. sect. v. Vol. ii. 33. [r] Plutarch, Sulla, vi. [s] Ibid. xxxv.

79[t]. But whether any of these things is competent to account for any such an oversight, or any such a negligence, in the administration of the calendar, B. C. 79, as gave occasion to the Nundinal incidence on the Kalends of January B. C. 78, we cannot undertake to say. All that we shall venture to observe upon it is that if it was the effect of inadvertency the oversight was probably committed at the usual time of the intercalation in the month of February; and was probably not discovered until it was too late to prevent its consequences.

In all such cases as these however we ourselves are concerned only with the matter of fact; not with the causes or reasons which must have produced it. And in the present instance the fact itself is of very great importance to the confirmation of the truth of our Irregular Calendar as far as we have brought it down.

For in the first place, if the character of this year B. C. 78 is known from testimony to have been actually unity, that of the year before also, B. C. 79, is virtually determined thereby. It must have been some number, the difference of which and of the Nundinal epact of the year was unity; or which was the sum of unity, the character of B. C. 78, and of the Nundinal epact of B. C. 79. Such was the number 3, the character of U. C. 675 B. C. 79, as our calendar shews.

In the next place, the character of B. C. 79 having been 3, that of the year before, B. C. 80, in like manner must have been some number the difference of which and of the epact of the year was 3; that is, 5: as the calendar also shews it to have been. And so on, as far as we choose to go back into the preceding years and the previous details of the cycle, with the same method of reasoning.

It may be objected indeed to this mode of reasoning that it proves only that the Nundinal cycle of our calendar *may* have been the *true;* but not that it actually was so. In the case of the Nundinal, as in that of the Hebdomadal, cycle the difference of an entire cycle in excess or in defect of the truth would make no change in its apparent regularity and apparent continuity. It might go on under such circum-

[t] Plutarch, Sulla, xxxvi. xxxvii. Cf. Firmicus, De Astrologia, l. iii. p. 10, 11.

stances to all appearance just as consistently as ever; and yet differ in reality eight days from the truth.

But to this objection it may be replied that, though such an anomaly as that might be conceivable of the course and succession of the Nundinal cycle *per se*, it would not be possible nor conceivable of it under the circumstances of the case; that is, as entering perpetually into the *calendar*, and as constantly making a part of that. The fact which we know from testimony is that U. C. 676 B. C. 78 the *first day* of the *year* the *Kalends* of January was the *first day* of the *Nundinal* cycle. Now the Kalends of January did not depend on the course and succession of the Nundinal cycle. The Kalends of January were not regulated by the same law of succession as the feriæ of the Nundinal cycle; and, though the mere revolution of the Nundinal cycle in one and the same order perpetually would not be affected by giving eight days more or eight days less to the length of a particular year, the Kalends of January would. It is selfevident that, whatsoever was the actual Julian date of the Roman Kalends of January U. C. 676, it could not have been a day more or a day less at that particular time than what it was. Its actual Julian date at that particular point of time was the natural and necessary consequence of the entire succession of both noctidiurnal and annual time in the calendar, from B. C. 712 until then. Nor could a day more or a day less be given to the Kalends of January U. C. 676 without entailing the necessity of a corresponding change in the Kalends of January in every year before it.

With respect however to the administration of this sixth cycle of the Irregular calendar in general, so far as we have yet procceded with our examination of it, it appears to have gone on with sufficient regularity. The years alternated *pleni* and *cavi* or nearly so all along. If the third and fourth years, B. C. 87–86, and B. C. 86–85, were both *pleni* or intercalary; it should be remembered that these were years of great confusion in other respects: and that the calendar during them might well have sympathized with the general disorder of the times. The seventh year of the cycle B. C. 83–82 was the date of the death of the Pontifex Maximus,

Q. Mucius Scævola[u]; and no doubt before the month of February that year. The last regular intercalation, that of the sixth year, was consequently made by him.

The most remarkable phenomenon in the administration of this cycle is that of *four* intercalary years in sequence, from the 8th to the 11th inclusive, B. C. 81–78; the object of which it is not easy to divine, but the interposition of which, at this period of the decursus of the cycle, can neither be denied nor dispensed with. The Pontifex Maximus Metellus was the father-in-law of Sulla; and no doubt the will of the latter, had he thought proper to interfere in the administration of the calendar, would have been as absolute at this time in the Pontifical college as any where else at Rome. The intercalation of U. C. 673 B. C. 81 might perhaps be produced by a desire to raise the Kalends of January the next year, U. C. 674 B. C. 80, as nearly as possible to the same epoch as U. C. 602 B. C. 152; for U. C. 674 B. C. 80 was the first year of the fourth period of 24 years, from U. C. 602 B. C. 152. The change of the epoch of the Lustral cycle too, U. C. 674 B. C. 80[w], might have something to do with these arrangements of the calendar previously; and perhaps also the games and shows in honour of Hercules Fidius which Sulla was contemplating in this year: for if the date of those games was to be both the 4th of June Roman and June 25 Julian, this year, as it appears to have been, a particular management of the calendar previously would certainly be necessary to bring about that coincidence. The intercalation of B. C. 79 was possibly an oversight. But that of B. C. 78 might be intentionally admitted in order to lengthen the official year of Catulus, and to enable him the better to oppose the factious proceedings of Lepidus; which might have begun even before the usual time of the insertion of the Merkedonius in February, this year[x]: though that is not a certain point. After B. C. 78 to the end of the cycle the administration of the calendar appears to have gone on with a sufficient degree of regularity; and there is little or nothing to remark upon it.

[u] Supra, p. 31. [w] Diss. x. ch. i. sect. xi. Vol. ii. 289. [x] Cf. Vol. ii. 33.

SECTION VII.—i. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 15. 378 *days.*

U. C. 680 Varr. 679 Cap. 677 Polyb. B. C. 74.

L. Licinius Lucullus
M. Aurelius Cotta.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 2 B. C. 74. Nundinal Char. 7.

ii. Irregular Calendar, Cycle vi. 16. 355 days.

U. C. 681 Varr. 680 Cap. 678 Polyb. B. C. 73.

M. Terentius Varro Lucullus
C. Cassius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 15 B. C. 73. Nundinal Char. 5.

iii. Irregular Calendar, Cycle vi. 17. 378 days.

U. C. 682 Varr. 681 Cap. 679 Polyb. B. C. 72.

L. Gellius Poplicola
Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 4 B. C. 72. Nundinal Char. 2.

iv. Irregular Calendar, Cycle vi. 18. 378 days.

U. C. 683 Varr. 682 Cap. 680 Polyb. B. C. 71.

P. Cornelius Lentulus
Cn. Aufidius Orestes.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 17 B. C. 71. Nundinal Char. 8.

v. Irregular Calendar, Cycle vi. 19. 355 days.

U. C. 684 Varr. 683 Cap. 681 Polyb. B. C. 70.

Cn. Pompeius Magnus
M. Licinius Crassus.

Kalendæ Januariæ March 2 B. C. 70. Nundinal Char. 6.

i. *On the Chronology of the Actions of* Cicero *against* Verres.

These five years comprehend the whole of the period the

retrospect of which enters into the orations of Cicero contra Verrem.

The Prætura Urbana of Verres came in the first year, U. C. 680 L. Licinius Lucullus M. Aurelius Cotta[y] B. C. 74.

The first year of his Prætura Sicula was the next year, U. C. 681 M. Terentius Varro Lucullus C. Cassius [z], B. C. 73[z]. He was superseded by Metellus[a] in the *fourth* year, U. C. 683 P. Cornelius Lentulus Cn. Aufidius Orestes, B. C. 71; and the cause came on in the *fifth* year, U. C. 684 Cn. Pompeius Magnus[b] M. Licinius Crassus B. C. 70: so that he was three years in office as prætor of Sicily, as Cicero repeatedly asserts he was[c]: the reason of which appears to have been that Q. Arrius by whom he should have been succeeded in U. C. 682 B. C. 72 for some reason or other never came into the province at all[d].

In the history of the Prætura Urbana nothing is found which is calculated to illustrate our calendar; though dates occur in it, especially with reference to one transaction in particular, the repairs of the Ædes Castoris[e], and to the terms prescribed by the edict of Verres for that purpose, the Ides of September and the Kalends of December[f]. The year being U. C. 680, the Ides of September answered to Nov. 1 B. C. 74, and the Kalends of December to January 17 B. C. 73. And that may throw some light on the observations which Cicero makes upon them: Diem præstituit operi faciundo Kalendas Decembres, locat circiter Idus Septembres. angustiis temporis excluduntur omnes. quid ergo? Rabonius istum diem quomodo assequitur? nemo Rabonio molestus est neque Kalendis Decembribus (Jan. 17 B. C. 73) neque Nonis (Jan. 21) neque Idibus (Jan. 29): denique aliquanto in provinciam

[y] Actio ii. lib. v. 13, 34: cf. iii 7, 16. Asconius, Arg. in Orat. De Divin. Actio in Verr. i. 13, 44.

[z] Actio ii. lib. i. 23, 60: 47, 125: lib. iii. 41, 97. Asconius, in ii Contra Verr. p. 25.

[a] Actio ii. lib. ii. 15, 37: 25, 62: 56, 139: lib. iii. 16, 43: 53, 123.

[b] Actio i. 6, 17: 7, 18: 9, 26. 27: Actio ii. lib. i. 12, 34: 13, 34: 57, 149: lib. iii. 88, 204: 95, 222. Cf. Asconius, p. 1. In Divin., p. 23, 24: In ii Contra Verr., Ib. p. 35: 52: In iii Contra Verr., Ib. p. 68: 86: In iv Contra Verrem.

[c] Divinatio, 1, 3: 4, 11. In Verr. Actio i. 4, 12: 5, 13: 14, 40. Actio ii. lib. ii. 12, 31: 20, 49: 54, 136: 57, 140: 75, 184: lib. iii. 8, 21: 43, 101. 103: 44, 104: 68, 160: 69, 163: 77, 178: 87, 201: lib. iv. 10, 23: 19, 41: 26, 59. 60: 32, 72: 46, 103: 61, 136: lib. v. 22, 58: cf. 8, 21.

[d] Actio ii. lib. ii. 15, 37: lib. iv. 20, 42. Asconius, p. 4. In Divin.

[e] Actio i. 4, 12: ii. lib. i. 40, 104: 50, 130-59, 154.

[f] Actio ii. lib. i. 56, 148: cf. 54, 141.

iste proficiscitur prius quam opus effectum est. Now that was possible, if the Kalends of December were falling on January 17. In March or April after Verres might be setting out to his province. It appears from the sequel that the acquittance for this contract on the part of Verres was actually later than his return from Sicily, and the institution of the proceedings against him which ensued upon it: Opus in acceptum retulit quadriennio post quam diem operi dixerat. That is, *four* years from the Ides of September U. C. 680 Nov. 1 B. C. 74: consequently some time not long before the Ides of September U. C. 684 Nov. 6 B. C. 70: between the return of Cicero from Sicily that year and the date of the first action, the Nones of Sextilis September 30.

ii. *On the first year of the* Prætura Sicula; *and on the edict of Verres relating to the* Decuman Corn.

It is well known to the learned that the charges brought against Verres in these actions of Cicero, and the matters of fact by which they are substantiated, though extending over the whole period of his government, are not arranged in the order of time; for which reason it is not always easy to determine to which of the three years, passed by him in Sicily, a particular allegation or a particular fact belongs. The proceedings however, relating to the tithe corn, the Frumentum Decumanum, as Cicero calls it, and the charges founded upon them, we are of opinion, may most properly be referred to the first year of his administration U. C. 681 B. C. 73. And among these, for the illustration of the calendar of the time, we select the case of Q. Septitius, which arose out of the fact that the farming of this Decuman corn had been let by Verres to a creature of his own, Apronius; who figures throughout the whole of the history of this part of his administration.

Quid? illa cujusmodi sunt quæ ex tempore ab Apronio admonitus edixit? Q. Septitio honestissimo nomine equiteque Romano resistente Apronio et affirmante se plus decuma non daturum; exoritur peculiare edictum repentinum, ne quis frumentum de area tolleret ante quam cum decumano pactus esset. ferebat hanc quoque iniquitatem Septitius, et imbri frumentum corrumpi in area patiebatur; cum illud edictum

repente uberrimum et quæstuosissimum nascitur, ut ante Kalendas Sextiles omnes decumas ad aquas deportatas haberent[g]. This means that they were to be transported against that day to the seas, or the ports; i.e. wheresoever they would be most in readiness to be shipped for Rome: this Decuman or tithe corn being the property of the Roman people.

That this edict was to be referred to the first year of Verres might be probably concluded from the following considerations. i. Because it is not probable that when Septitius thus ventured to oppose the exactions of a creature of Verres he could yet have had the experience of even one year of his administration, much less of two or three, to warn him of what he had to expect from a resistance of that kind. ii. Because Cicero styles the second of the edicts issued on this occasion Uberrimum et quæstuosissimum; and yet he himself asserts elsewhere that the farmers had been ruined by the exactions of Verres and his creatures by the second year, and had been absolutely driven to despair in the third, so as to leave the lands totally unsown[h]. Thirdly, because this dispute between Septitius and Apronius is said to have arisen out of the first edict relating to the tithe corn: Quantum decumanus edidisset aratorem sibi decumæ dare oportere ut tantum arator decumano dare cogeretur[i]: in opposition to which it must have been that Septitius had refused to pay more than the tenth, required by the law, and by the rule and practice hitherto.

And that the first year of his government, U. C. 681 B. C. 73, was actually the year intended in this representation, may be proved by the testimony of our calendar.

That harvest would be over in Sicily every year by the autumnal equinox it cannot be necessary to prove. That the corn would be threshed too in Sicily, as well as every where else among the Greeks, as soon as it had been reaped, may also be taken for granted; or if there is any doubt upon that

[g] Actio ii. lib. iii. 14, 36: cf. 8, 21–9, 24.

[h] Actio ii. lib. iii. 18, 47: 32, 57: 33, 77: 43, 101: 44, 104: 46, 110: 51, 120. He says also, (18, 47,) that these oppressive measures against the farmers of the tithe lands began *four* years before he himself came into Sicily (to collect the evidence for the prosecution): and as that was B. C. 70 U. C. 684 these measures must have begun U. C. 681 B. C. 73. Cf. also 43, 101.

[i] ii. lib. iii. 10, 25.

point it would be removed by the testimony of Cicero himself in these very orations against Verres[k]: which proves that both the process of reaping and that of threshing out the corn were always going on in Sicily most actively at midsummer or soon after it. It will follow from this fact however that the Kalends of Sextilis, mentioned by name in the second edict, before which the corn had not only been reaped but threshed out, could not have been later than August or September. And as they were specified also as the latest time by which the tithe corn, intended to be sent to Rome, was to be ready for shipping; it is only a reasonable inference from that fact too that so far from falling later than the autumnal equinox in the year in question they must in reality have fallen a certain length of time before it: long enough at least to allow the corn brought down to the coast by that day to be shipped and transported to Rome before the autumnal equinox itself.

Now U.C. 683 in the third year of Verres' prætorship of Sicily the Kalends of Sextilis fell on October 6 B.C. 71; in the second year U.C. 682 they fell on September 23 B.C. 72: but in the first year U.C. 681 they fell on September 10 B.C. 73. It is clear then that this last only could have been the date specified in the decree: both the former must have been too late in the year. The calendar therefore confirms the conclusion respecting the year, in which these proceedings were instituted, to which we have been led by the considerations premised above; and it throws further light on the facts of the case, and on the reasons or grounds of these proceedings themselves: at least why the day fixed in the edict should have been this of the Kalends of Sextilis, and no other. It was probably the latest which could have been fixed on with safety for such a purpose as that of transporting the corn to Italy before the autumnal equinox; after which the sea must have been considered to be shut. For the true date of the autumnal equinox at this time was not falling later than September 25: and that would allow only 15 days for the conveyance of the corn to Rome after the 10th *.

* It must be admitted that lib. iii. 20, 51. Cicero appears to date this de-

[k] Actio ii. lib. iv. 12, 29.

We may still further illustrate these conclusions by what Cicero afterwards observes of the corn which had been brought from Sicily in the year of the action itself U. C. 684 B. C. 70.

He tells us previously that L. Metellus, the prætor who superseded Verres in U. C. 684 B. C. 70, wrote letters the year before his coming into the province (U. C. 683 B. C. 71) to the farmers of the Decuman lands, exhorting them to plow and sow as they had always done up to the time of Verres; and promising to revive and respect the old rule which had regulated the price of the tenths of the produce, the Lex Hieronica as Cicero calls it all through these actions: a law and a rule which had been devised and imposed by Hiero, king of Sicily, the ally of the Romans in the second Punic war; and because of its fairness and equitableness had been invariably observed by the Roman prætors of Sicily themselves[l], before the time of Verres. Ille vero tum se Metellum minime fore putasset si te ulla in re imitatus esset: qui ab urbe Roma, quod nemo unquam post hominum memoriam fecit, cum sibi in provinciam proficiscendum putaret, litteras ad Siciliæ civitates misit per quas hortatur et rogat ut serant in beneficio populi Romani. hoc petit aliquanto ante adventum suum; et simul ostendit se lege Hieronica venditurum: hoc est in omni ratione decumarum nihil isti simile facturum.

That these letters were written and sent to Sicily U. C. 683 B. C. 71 appears from the mention of Pompey, directly after, as consul designatus only at the time[m]; and he was elected consul at the comitia consularia of that year, as Metellus was

cree *anno tertio:* Nam ut vadimonium decumano quocunque is vellet promitteretur; ut ex area nisi pactus esset arator ne tolleret; ut ante Kalend. Sext. decumas deportatas haberet: hæc omnia venditis decumis *anno tertio* te edixisse dico. The necessity of the case requires that we should suppose an error in the reading here; of *tertio* for *primo*. The Kal. Sextiles in Verres' third year must have been Oct. 6 B. C. 71: and at that time he must have been leaving his province. This edict which Cicero represents as so productive of gain to him never could have been deferred to the end of his government, or issued only just when he was expecting to be superseded.

[l] Actio ii. lib. iii. 6, 12-8, 20. [m] Ibid. 18, 45.

elected prætor at the comitia prætoria: and that he despatched these letters to Sicily only as prætor designatus also, at the time, Cicero himself implies by adding: Atque hæc non cupiditate aliqua scribit adductus ut in alienam provinciam mitteret litteras ante tempus; sed consilio: ne si tempus sationis præteriisset granum in provincia Sicilia nullum haberemus.

Hæ litteræ, he continues, judices L. Metelli quas audistis hoc quantum est ex Sicilia frumenti hornotini exaraverunt. glebam commôsset in agro decumano Siciliæ nemo si Metellus hanc epistolam non misisset[n]. It follows that when these words were spoken, or are to be supposed to have been spoken, the corn of that year's growth must already have been brought from Sicily. And though it is true that none of these actions against Verres was really delivered, except the first, (if even that was so); yet the date of that was the Nones of Sextilis U.C. 684, Sept. 30 B.C. 70: and the supposed delivery of the rest is circumscribed by the date of the end of the Ludi Romani, Sept. 12 Roman Nov. 5, and that of the beginning of the Ludi Victoriæ, October 29 Roman Dec. 21, the same year[o]. The corn then of the growth of B.C. 71—70 must already have arrived at Rome from Sicily before September 30 B.C. 70*.

* From the above passages we learn by implication the date of the consular comitia, U.C. 683 B.C. 71, when Pompey and Crassus were elected. It must have been before seed-time; that is, before the month of October. The comitia consularia U.C. 684 B.C. 70 were held vi Kal. Sextiles[1], Sept. 21. They were probably held about the same time the year before.

U.C. 683 B.C. 71 was the last year of the war of Spartacus, or the Gladiators, or the Fugitivi[2]. Appian[2] tells us that Crassus, despatched against them at the beginning of the year, was six months employed on that service, before he returned to be a candidate for the consulship. This would imply that he set out in March, in the Roman February this year, which began March 18.

This war, according to Appian[3], lasted three years; that is, B.C. 71

1 Asconius, p. 30 in ii. contra Verrem.

2 Appian, B.C. i. 116—121. Livy, xcv-xcvii. Voll. Pat. ii. 34. Plutarch, Crassus, viii. ix. x. xi. Pompeius, xxi. Florus, iii. 20.

3 i. 118. Eutropius, vi. 7. Orosius, v. 24.

n Actio ii. lib. iii. 17, 44: 18, 45: cf. 52, 121: 53, 123.

o Cf. ii. lib. iv. 15, 33.

iii. *On the second year of the Prætura Sicula of Verres; and on the case of* Sthenius *of Himera or Thermæ.*

That the history of *this* case, that of Sthenius of Himera[p] or Thermæ, belongs to the second year, U. C. 682 B. C. 72, there can be no doubt; the consuls of the year, Cn. Lentulus and L. Gellius, (those of U. C. 682 B. C. 72,) being mentioned by name[q] in the account of it, when Sthenius was at Rome.

Now among the other particulars of this case we are told that, in order to escape from the violence which Verres was meditating against him, Sthenius was obliged to fly to Rome, Thermis Sthenius Romam profugit; and that too in the winter season: Hiemi sese fluctibusque committere maluit quam non istam communem Siculorum tempestatem calamitatemque vitare[r]. In consequence of this flight a false accusation was got up by Verres against him in his absence; in answer to which he cited him to appear before him in person on the Kalends of December: Edicit statim ut Kalendis Decembribus adsit Sthenius Syracusis[s].

was its third year. If so, it must have broken out B. C. 73. He mentions that in this last year, B. C. 71, Lucullus returning from Asia, and now at Brundusium, contributed to its termination. But he has confounded in this instance L. Lucullus, consul U. C. 680 B. C. 74, with M. Lucullus, his cousin, consul U. C. 681 B. C. 73. This latter might be returning from his province (Macedonia and Thrace) at the end of U. C. 683 B. C. 71, in time to assist Crassus[4].

The war of the Fugitivi is alluded to by Cicero also[5], as having coincided in part with the administration of Sicily by Verres; and so it must have done, if it lasted from B. C. 73–71. It appears from him also that some part of it came within the term of the government of the prætor before Verres[6], (C. Norbanus.) The last half of his year might coincide with the beginning of the war in question.

The remainder of these Fugitivi, having been driven into Bruttium, were meditating a passage into Sicily when they were finally cut off by Crassus[7].

4 Eutropius, vi. 6—8. Livy, xcvii. Fasti Triumphales, U. C. 682.

5 Oratio x. In Verr. ii. lib. v. 2, 5–4, 8.

6 Ibid. 4, 8: cf. 21, 55: iii. 49, 117.

7 Florus, iii. 20, 13.

p Actio ii. lib. ii. 34, 82—41, 101: 35, 86: lib. iv. 19, 41.

q Ibid. 39, 95.

r Ibid. 37, 91.

s Ibid. 38, 92—95.

It appears too that Sthenius must have so timed his escape from Sicily as to have been arrived at Rome 30 days at least before the Kalends in question; for the news of this citation at Syracuse followed him to Rome, and reached him there 30 days before the day appointed for his appearance: Et erat spatium dierum fere triginta ante Kalendas Decembres; quo die isté ut Sthenius Syracusis adesset edixerat[t]. And as all this came in the year of Gellius and Lentulus, which entered on the Kalends of January U. C. 682, Feb. 4 B. C. 72; it is manifest that it must have been only at the end of their year, U. C. 682 B. C. 72 *exeunte*, that Sthenius could have come to Rome.

The Roman December, U. C. 682, would bear date January 19 B. C. 71: the Roman November December 21 B. C. 72. If Sthenius was already at Rome on or before the Kalends of November, U. C. 682, he could not have set sail from Sicily later than the Ides of October Dec. 4; and he might have done so earlier. Winter must be considered to have set in long before that time; and winterly weather would have been nothing extraordinary even before the middle of November. It is most probable that Sthenius actually made the passage towards the end of November. Cicero clearly speaks of the time of the year, when he was crossing the sea, as Adversum navigationi; though the passage was made in safety: Hic, qui Romam venisset, satisque feliciter anni jam adverso tempore navigasset, omniaque habuisset æquiora et placabiliora quam animum prætoris atque hospitis, rem ad amicos suos detulit[u]: that is, the citation from Verres just received. That citation itself would probably follow him without much delay; and if it reached him at Rome before the Kalends of November (Dec. 21) it had probably been despatched from Sicily soon after the Ides of October: in which case Sthenius too must have made his escape only a few days earlier.

iv. *On the chronology of the year of the Action*, U. C. 684 B. C. 70.

We proceed in the last place to the year of the accusation or action itself, U. C. 684 B. C. 70.

One date in this year has been handed down in *terms*, the

[t] Actio ii. Lib. ii. 39, 96: 38, 92—40, 97. [u] ii. Lib. ii. 38, 95.

Nonæ Sextiles, the date of the *Actio prima;* Nonæ sunt hodie Sextiles[w], September 30 B. C. 70: and Asconius has preserved another, that of the Comitia consularia the same year, vi Kalendas Sextiles[x], September 21: to which Cicero also alludes[y] at the time of the action as but lately over. Neither of these dates was Nundinal; though iv Kalendas Sextiles Quinctilis 29 was so, and viii Id. Sextiles (Sextilis 6) likewise.

But the chronology of these proceedings requires to be traced much further back. It appears that, after the decision of the question De Divinatione, when the conduct of the accusation of Verres was committed to Cicero instead of to Q. Cæcilius Niger the quæstor of Verres, he applied for a certain number of days, before the case should come on; in order to go to Sicily and collect the materials for the prosecution. Some one however, at that point of time, was suborned by the opposite party to commence a similar suit against the prætor of Achaia; and to apply for a similar grant of time for the same kind of purpose: but so as to profess to be satisfied with *two* days less than the term for which Cicero had made application. Itaque cum ego diem in Sicilia inquirendi perexiguam postulavissem; invenit iste qui sibi in Achaiam biduo breviorem diem postularet[z]— Interposuistis accusatorem qui cum ego mihi c et x dies solos in Siciliam postulassem c et viii sibi in Achaiam postularet[a]. And this *accusator Achaïcus,* according to Asconius[b], was either Rupilius or Q. Metellus Nepos; and the *reus* denounced by him was either Oppius or Curio.

The object however of this pretended accusation of the prætor of Achaia was to gain time in behalf of Verres: for as Cicero had stipulated for 110 days and this second accuser for 108, whatsoever despatch he might himself make in prosecuting and completing his inquiries in Sicily, he could not come into court with his case, nor actually be heard in accusation, until this other accuser had used up his time too. Though therefore this *Inquisitor Achaïcus,* as he complains[c], never got as far on his way to Achaia as Brundisium, while he himself was travers-

[w] i. 10, 31.
[x] P. 30, in ii Contra Verrem.
[y] i. 6, 17: 7, 18. Cf. 8, 22.
[z] i. 2, 6. Cf. Asconius, p. 23.
[a] ii. Lib. i. 11, 30. [b] P. 26.
[c] i. 2, 6. Cf. ii. Lib. i. 6, 16.

ing the whole of Sicily; and though he made such a diligent use of his time in Sicily as to finish his business there in fifty days[c]; still he was obliged to wait until the expiration of the 108 days, which had been allowed to the other prosecutor, before he could do any thing further: by which means, as he himself observes, he was robbed of *three months* of the time which would have been the most suitable of all for his purpose, and free from those interruptions and delays to which the time actually left him, between the Nones of September and the end of the year, was notoriously exposed: Menses mihi tres cum eripuissetis ad agendum maxime appositos[d].

Now since it appears from his own account that he had demanded only 110 days, and that he actually spent 50 of these in Sicily; he must have lost at the utmost through this contrivance of the opposite party only 108—50 or 58 days. If then he was robbed in reality of only 58 days, it is not easy to see in what sense he could complain of having lost three months; unless these 58 days *de facto* contained among them *parts* at least of three distinct months. On this supposition, the *third* month must have been Sextilis, in which the case came on at last; and so much of that month as had elapsed up to the Nones, on which day the case was opened, must be set down to the account of that month. There would remain 58—4 or 54 days: and 31 of them must go to the month before Sextilis, that is the month Quinctilis. It follows that the first month of the three must have been Junius; and the part of Junius which Cicero had lost must have been the last twenty-three days, from the 7th inclusive to the end. On this principle the last of the 50 days actually passed in Sicily, in making inquiries there, must have been the 6th of the Roman Junius; and therefore the first must have been the 17th of the Roman April, June 14 B.C. 70. Cicero then must have arrived in Sicily not later than June 14 B.C. 70; and whensoever he himself arrived there Metellus, the regular prætor of the year, had not yet been 30 days in the island before him[e].

The action itself was opened in court on the Nones of

[c] Ibid. loc. cit.
[d] ii. Lib. i. 11, 30. Cf. Asconius, p. 54, 55.
[e] ii. Lib. ii. 57, 140. Cf. 56, 130: Lib. iii. 26, 64.

Sextilis, at or after the ninth hour of the day: Nonæ sunt hodie Sextiles: hora nona convenire cœpistis: for which reason he reckons that day as good as lost: Hunc diem jam ne numerant quidem. In ten days' time the Ludi Votivi of Pompey (for the close of the Bellum Servile B. C. 71 [f]), and after these the Ludi Romani, and by and by the Ludi Victoriæ of Sulla [g], and then the Ludi Plebeii, might all be looked for in their turns. Decem dies sunt ante Ludos Votivos quos Cn. Pompeius facturus est: hi ludi dies quindecim auferent. deinde continuo Romani consequentur. ita prope xl diebus interpositis tum denique se ad ea quæ a nobis dicta erunt responsuros esse arbitrantur. deinde se ducturos et dicendo et excusando facile ad Ludos Victoriæ. cum his Plebeios esse conjunctos: secundum quos aut nulli aut pauci dies ad agendum futuri sunt *.

It appears from the sequel that the time actually taken up in these first proceedings was nine days [h]; which are probably to be reckoned inclusive of the Nones of Sextilis, though so little of that day was still remaining when the court met. If so, they extended down to the day before the Ludi Votivi of Pompey exclusive; Sextilis 14 October 9. These games would begin the next day, Sextilis 15 October 10; and they would last (15 days) until Pridie Kalendas Septembres October 24 inclusive. The Ludi Romani would

* There is no mention here of any Ludi Circenses; though in the Julian calendar games of that name follow the Ludi Romani; from September 15–19. They might be included under the name of Ludi Romani in general; for those too were Ludi Circenses, and by way of distinction, Ludi Circenses *Magni*. In a subsequent reference (Actio ii. Lib. iv. 15, 33) the Ludi Circenses are alluded to as comprehended in the period of the Comperendinatio of Verres.

The Ludi Circenses are recognized Philippica ii. 43, 110. Cf. v. 7, 19: i. 4, 11: 5, 12: 6, 14. Philippica i was delivered September 2 Roman; Antony's answer to it 17 days after; xiii. Kal. Octobres, September 19 Roman. Philippica ii also is supposed to have been delivered the same day, September 19, in answer to Antony. Cf. 44, 112: v. 7, 19. 20. Now the day before this, September 18, is called the *fourth* of the Ludi in Circo: ii. 43, 110. Consequently September 15 must have been the *first*. And that is agreeable to the calendars, which have the Equorum Probatio indeed on the 14th, but the Ludi in Circo first on the 15th.

[f] Asconius, p. 36. [g] Ibid. 37. [h] Lib. i. 7, 20: 60, 156.

begin September 4 Roman October 28, and would last to September 12 Roman November 5.

Now as the law allowed both the accuser and the defender twenty days[i], (the one for the accusation, the other for the defence,) and Cicero had yet made use of no more of his twenty than nine; it would follow that even after the expiration of the Ludi Romani, September 12 Roman November 5 Julian, there would still be eleven of the twenty remaining, September 12–23 inclusive, which by law must be regarded as the property of the accuser: whether he chose to make any use of them or not. And until these days also had expired the accused party could not be expected to enter on his defence; if he did not otherwise care to do so. The object of Verres and of his counsel in the case was to gain time by every means in their power; and it was not to be supposed that he would begin his defence a moment earlier than the law compelled him to do so.

This being the case, we may observe that from the 13th of Sextilis the last of the nine days' action of Cicero to the 24th of September Roman, the first day on which Verres could be legally compelled or expected to enter on his defence, there would be just 40 days. September 24 would be the 40th day itself. This consequently must be what Cicero means by his allusion to the possible case of a reply on the 40th day, or after 40 days; when the accusation might have been so long over as almost to have been forgotten[k]. It follows consequently that these forty days could have had nothing to do with the interval between the Ludi Romani and the Ludi Victoriæ; and therefore that in explaining them of this interval Cicero's learned commentator Asconius[l] must have made a mistake. They can be referred to nothing but the close of Cicero's first action, Sextilis 13, (which in fact was the close of the proceedings on his part *once for all*,) and the hypothetical commencement of the reply of Verres, 12 days after the Ludi Romani, September 24 Roman; until which time the cause is supposed to have been *comperendinated*, *ampliated*, or put off for a fresh hearing, at the close of the first proceedings themselves.

[i] Asconius, 55, In iii Contra Verrem.
[l] P. 41, 42: In ii. Contra Verr.
[k] Actio, i. 18, 54: ii. Lib. ii. 11, 30.

And as to the interval in question between the Ludi Romani and the Ludi Victoriæ, it may be collected from a subsequent passage that it must have been 45 days. Cicero had just been speaking of the contrivance of Verres, whereby he had managed to strike 45 days all at once out of the calendar of Cephaledum in Sicily: and this leads him to observe, Hoc si Romæ fieri posset certe aliqua ratione expugnasset iste ut dies xlv inter binos ludos tollerentur per quos solos judicium fieri posset [m]. The last day of the Ludi Romani being September 12 Roman, this gives the first day of the Ludi Victoriæ, the 46th day after, October 29 Roman, iv Kalendas Novembres; leaving 45 days clear between the last day of the Ludi Romani and the first day of these Ludi Victoriæ.

And we are strongly inclined to the opinion that this day, iv Kal. Novembres, October 29 Roman, was the actual date of these Ludi Victoriæ as originally instituted by Sulla, and as still kept up at this time; though in the Maffæan calendar, as we have seen, the date assigned them is vi Kalendas Novembres, October 27 Roman. This opinion is much confirmed by the Nundinal character of the Roman October, U. C. 674 B. C. 80, when these games were probably first celebrated; for that being 4 the 28th was Nundinal, but not the 29th; so that these games would begin in the first instance on the day after the Nundinal day [n]. Moreover since it appears from the Antiatine calendar that there were games *in circo* on the first of November also, which must have been included originally in these Ludi Victoriæ of Sulla; these games in the Julian calendar on that principle must have lasted from the vi Kal. Novembres inclusive to the Kal. Novembres inclusive also; i. e. six days in all. Consequently if they began originally on October 29 Roman, they must have lasted until November 3 Roman inclusive; and November 1 the day of the victory commemorated by them would be the middle day of the entire celebrity. And if this was the last day of these games at this time, they ended only the day before the date of the Ludi Plebeii; which according to the Antiatine calendar also began Pridie Nonas Novembres (November 4 Roman): and that would explain Cicero's observation that the Ludi Plebeii joined on to the Ludi Victoriæ: Cum

[m] Lib. ii. 52, 130.

[n] See supra, p. 296.

his Plebeios esse conjunctos. The date of these Ludi Victoriæ in the calendar must some time or other have been shifted from the iv Kalendas Novembres to the vi Kalendas Novembres; and so as to make the games of the Kalendæ Novembres the last of the six. And as these are their dates in the Julian calendar, this change was probably made by Augustus: and one reason for it might be to allow of some interval between the end of the Ludi Victoriæ and the begining of the Ludi Plebeii.

The chronology then of this celebrated accusation may be briefly stated as follows:

i. On the Nones of Sextilis U. C. 684 Sept. 30 B. C. 70, the court assembles, and Cicero opens the case.

ii. On the *ninth* day after, Sextilis 13, October 8, he concludes his case for the present; and Verres is comperendinated until after the holidays.

iii. On the eleventh day, Sextilis 15, October 10, the Ludi Votivi of Pompey begin. And herein we may observe *this* coincidence; that Sextilis 14 being Nundinal they began on the day after a Nundinal day: and as they lasted *fifteen* days they would end on the day *before* a Nundinal day, as well as on the last day of Sextilis itself October 24; and that was probably the reason why they were limited to fifteen days exactly.

iv. The first three days of September are not taken into account. In the Julian calendar they were all Nefasti. Pridie Nonas, September 4 Roman, October 28, the Ludi Romani, Ludi Circenses Magni, begin and last to Pridie Idus; September 12 Roman, November 5, inclusive. And that this was their actual date in Cicero's time has already been seen from his own testimony [o].

v. On the Ides of September, November 6, the court must be supposed to have met again, and the rest of the proceedings on the part of the accusation to have begun and continued until the expiration of the accuser's twenty days [p]; viii Kal. Octobres, September 23 Roman, November 16 inclusive: after which, on September 24 the accused party would have been bound to enter upon his defence.

[o] Supra, 256.

[p] Actio, ii. Lib. i. sqq.

v. *On the date of the Vulcanalia, U. C.* 679, 680, *or* 681. *B. C.* 75 *or* 74 *or* 73.

A date too which belongs to this period in general, though to what point of time in the period exactly may be doubtful, is extant in the fragments of Sallust: Curio Vulcanaliorum die ibidem moratus[q].

In an earlier fragment there is another notice, relating to the movements of the same individual: Eodem anno in Macedonia C. Curio, principio veris cum exercitu profectus in Dardaniam, quibus potuit modis dictas pecunias coegit[r].

C. Scribonius Curio was consul U. C. 678 B. C. 76. In the Epitome of Livy[s] his reduction of the Dardani is supposed to have synchronised with the year in which the war of Spartacus broke out: i. e. U. C. 681 B. C. 73[t]. According to Eutropius[u] he was sent into Macedonia Post consulatum, i. e. B. C. 75; which we think is confirmed by Lactantius[w], on the authority of Varro: and, he finished the war Intra triennium[x], that is B. C. 73. And this is consistent with the date of his triumph De Macedonia et Dardania, according to Sigonius; U. C. 682 B. C. 72: the consular year of L. Gellius and Cn. Lentulus.

We should be of opinion that the Vulcanalia, above alluded to, Sextilis 21 Roman, were either those of U. C. 679 Sept. 28 B. C. 75, or those of U. C. 681 Sept. 30 B. C. 73; not those of U. C. 680 Oct. 11 B. C. 74. At either of the preceding times Curio might still have been employed in active operations: at the latter in particular, he would probably have been in quarters for the winter.

vi. *On the date of the birth of Virgil U. C.* 684 *B. C.* 74.

The birth of Virgil was another of the events of these five years; for it is agreed that he was born on the Ides of October in the first consulate of Pompey and Crassus, U. C.

[q] Tom. ii. 101. Fragm. iv. 9. Apud Nonium.
[r] Tom. ii. 47. Fragm. iii. 1. Apud Nonium.
[s] xcv. cf. xcii. Also Frontinus, De Strateg. iv. i. 43.
[t] Supra, 307 note.
[u] vi. 2.
[x] Cf. Orosius, vi. 3. 4, 6.
[w] i. 6. Florus, iii.

684[y]; the Julian date of which Roman day was December 7 B. C. 70.

The Vita ascribed to Donatus[z] mentions that according to the custom of the country on such occasions a twig of poplar was planted on the day of his birth; which grew so rapidly as soon to equal the size of others which had been planted the same year long before it. Even to admit the truth of this statement, it would be no objection to the date of his birth, December 7; for such a thing was possible of the growth of a young and vigorous shoot, planted in a favourable situation even as late as December 7: which nevertheless was two or three weeks before the solstice. The life in metre by Phocas the grammarian adds another circumstance of the birth, of a much more equivocal description: that of a swarm of bees, which is represented to have settled on the infant Virgil soon after his birth. Not but that there might have been such a natural phenomenon as the swarming of bees even at the beginning of December[a]. But we do not hesitate to reject this circumstance as purely imaginary; and invented in this case to serve as a counterpart to the same kind of occurrence which had been handed down of the birth of Pindar and of that of Plato.

The life by Donatus[z] informs us also that the first seven years of his childhood were passed at Cremona; and that he assumed the Toga Virilis in his xvth year; Iisdem consulibus iterum quibus natus erat: and it adds that the poet Lucretius died the same day: Evenitque ut eo ipso die Lucretius poeta discederet[b]. Crassus and Pompey were consuls together the second time U. C. 699 B. C. 55: and on the Ides of October that year (October 2 B. C. 55) Virgil completed his fifteenth, and entered on his sixteenth year. If he assumed the Toga at the Liberalia last before, March 17 Roman U. C. 699 March 9 Julian B. C. 55, it would be strictly in his 15th year. The old reading of the text in this instance was the xviith year; which was in error.

[y] Photius, Codex 97. 84. l. 18. Martial, xii. 68. 3. Pliny, Epp. iii. 7. Vita, pag. 1. Hieronymus, in Chron. Ol. 177. 3. Prosper, in Chronico, 698. D. The Vita loco cit. specifies the name of the village or hamlet (Pagus,) in which he was born, Andes, near Mantua.

[a] *Pag. ii.* [z] *See supra, p. 276.*

[b] *Cf. Hieronymus Chron. ad Ol.* 181. 4.

Lastly, the same Vita by Donatus dates his death on the x Kalendas Octobres, C. Sentio Q. Lucretio Coss. September 22 Roman U. C. 735, and September 22 Julian B. C. 19[c]; and in his 52nd year: though, if he was really born on the Ides of October U. C. 684 and really died on this day U. C. 735, he must have been still in his 51st year; he must have wanted 23 days of his 52nd year. But whether he did actually die in this year, according to the Vita, or some years later, (as appears to be implied by the much better authority of Pliny the elder, and by the testimony of Horace his contemporary, and by various considerations of another kind,) was a question which we had occasion to discuss in one of our former works: and to that we refer the reader[d].

SECTION VIII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 20. 377 days.

U. C. 685 Varr. 684 Cap. 682 Polyb. B. C. 69.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 20 B. C. 69. Nundinal Char. 3.

On the date of the victory of Lucullus over Tigranes U. C. 685 B. C. 69.

In this year also a date has been recorded which serves to illustrate our calendar; that of the victory of Lucullus over Tigranes king of Armenia under the walls of Tigranocerta; Πρὸ μιᾶς Νονῶν Ὀκτωβρίων[e], Pridie Nonas Octobres, October 6 Roman; a day rendered memorable in the Roman calendar, but only as one of bad omen, by the defeat of Cæpio, U. C. 649 B. C. 105, of which we have already made mention[f]: until this success of Lucullus on the same day redeemed its character and made it glorious and auspicious.

Concerning the *year* of this victory there can be no question. It was the fourth year of Olympiad clxxvii according to Phlegon[g]: i. e. B. C. 69–68. It was the year which preceded the consular year of Quintus Marcius Rex, according to Dio[h]; in which year too he was sole consul; both his

[c] Cf. Jerome, Chron. Ol. 190. 2.

[d] Dissertations on the Principles and Arrangement of an Harmony of the Gospels, vol. iv. 88. Appendix, Diss. xvii.

[e] Plutarch, Lucullus, xxvii; cf. Camillus, xix. Apopthegmata, Lucullus, i.

[f] Supra, 247.

[g] Photius, Cod. 97. p. 84. l. 20.

[h] xxxv. 2. 4. Cf. Livy, xcvii.

regular colleague for the year, L. Cæcilius Metellus, and the consul suffect on his death, having died at the beginning of the year. That is, it was the consular year of Q. Hortensius and Q. Cæcilius Metellus (Creticus,) U. C. 685 B. C. 69.

It appears from Plutarch[i] that Lucullus in the first instance marched this year from Ephesus to Sinope on the Pontus; and both laid siege to that city and took it before he set out on his expedition against Tigranes. The distance from Ephesus to Sinope would be 500 Roman miles direct, 560 by road at least: and that would require 40 days' march even at the rate of 14 miles a day, and without intermission. And as he did not take the field until late in the year, though Sinope appears to have been speedily reduced, it must have been late in the summer before he could have been in a condition to march against Tigranes.

Now it appears that he marched from Sinope direct to Tigranocerta Διὰ τῆς Σωφηνῆς[k]; and that he had to cross both the Euphrates and the Tigris on the way: the latter not far from Tigranocerta itself[l]. We are told by Plutarch[m] that when he arrived at the Euphrates he found it swollen, and rendered impassable just at the time, by rain; but that it fell again so much and so unexpectedly in the course of the same day and of the following night, that he was able to ford it the next morning: *Λούκουλλος δὲ συντόνως ὁδεύσας ἐπὶ τὸν Εὐφράτην καὶ κατιόντα πολὺ καὶ θολερὸν ὑπὸ χειμῶνος εὑρὼν ἠσχαλλεν, ὡς διατριβῆς αὐτῷ καὶ πραγματείας ἐσομένης συνάγοντι πορθμεῖα καὶ πηγνυμένῳ σχεδίας· ἀρξάμενον δ' ἀφ' ἑσπέρας ὑποχωρεῖν τὸ ῥεῦμα καὶ μειούμενον διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἅμ' ἡμέρᾳ κοῖλον ὀφθῆναι παρέσχε τὸν ποταμόν.* We consider this fact a proof that Lucullus arrived at the river just at the juncture when the rainy season for those climates was wont to set in; but had not yet fairly begun. This swelling of the river, and yet speedy subsidence again, must have been a temporary and accidental effect, produced by recent rains in the vicinity. It could not have been the natural consequence of continued wet weather. And as the rainy season for those parts, (as

[i] Lucullus, xxiii. Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, lxxxiii. lxxxiv. Livy, xcviii. Photii Cod. 224. p. 237. 39–239. 18.

[k] Lucullus, xxiv.

[l] Cf. Ibid. xxvi. xxvii.

[m] Ibid. xxiv. Cf. Fragm. Sallustii, ii. 102. lib. iv.

we hope to shew on a future occasion,) commonly set in about the beginning of November; we may conclude that the time when he actually crossed the Euphrates was not earlier than the end of October.

The exact interval of time between this passage of the river and the battle under the walls of Tigranocerta it may not be possible to determine. Yet it does not appear to have been any thing considerable. The distance from any point on the Euphrates where Lucullus could be supposed to have crossed it on this occasion to Tigranocerta could not have been much less than 180 Roman miles direct, 200 by road; and that would require 14 or 15 days at least, at the rate of 14 miles a day. The river then having been crossed about the end of October; it cannot appear surprising that the date of the battle, under Tigranocerta, at last[n], Pridie Nonas Octobres, October 6 Roman, should turn out, according to our calendar, to have been December 9, B. C. 69. On the contrary this may justly be regarded as entirely consistent with the course of circumstances previously; and a great confirmation of the truth of our calendar itself.

It is observable however that according to the account of these proceedings which Photius has preserved from Memnon of Heraclea[o] there were *two* battles; the latter of them that to which the date in question belongs. And in connection with the former this author makes mention of the enemies' sending forward their κειμήλια, impedimenta, or baggage *by night*. This is probably an intimation of the full of the moon. The principal new moon of the year fell March 26: and the ninth moon or moon of Chisleu, Nov. 17. The full of this moon may be assumed on or about December 1; only eight days before the second and much more important and more decisive victory, that of October 6 Roman, December 9 Julian.

[n] Plutarch, Lucullus, xxiv—xxviii. Appian, Mithridatica, lxxxiv—lxxxvi. Dio, xxxv. 1. Livy, xcviii. Velleius Pat. ii. 33. Frontinus, ii. 1. 14. Eutropius, vi. 7. Suidas, Λούκουλλος.

[o] Codex 224. 238. 5—239. 1. Cf. Appian, lxxxv. It may be collected from Appian too, (lxxxv) that there was no moon on the night of the battle, until late at least: and Dec. 9 the moon would not rise until midnight.

SECTION IX.—*On the date of the Capture of Nisibis by Lucullus, U. C.* 686 *B. C.* 68.

From the account of the next year's proceedings also, those of U. C. 686 B. C. 68, we may probably collect the date of the capture by Lucullus of Antioch in Mygdonia, better known by the name of Nisibis; a city which makes a distinguished figure in later Roman history and in the contests of the Roman emperors with the kings of Persia, but in connection with the Roman history of the republic is now mentioned for the first time.

The campaign of this year, according to Dio[p], was opened by Lucullus Μεσοῦντος τοῦ θέρους, according to Plutarch[q], Θέρους ἀκμάζοντος; both which mean the same point of time. And this year also he again defeated Tigranes and Mithridates[q] on the river Arsanias not far from Artaxata. And that this must have been about the full of some moon may be inferred from the fact mentioned by Plutarch[q], that the pursuit lasted all the night; and if so it is determined by what is next related to the full moon of September: for when Lucullus was preparing to follow up this victory by marching without delay upon Artaxata he was unexpectedly stopped by a succession of storms; or rather by the setting in of winterly weather, though the season of the year was only that of the autumnal equinox: Ὥρᾳ δ' ἰσημερίας φθινοπωρινῆς οὐκ ἂν ἐλπίσαντι χειμῶνες ἐπέπεσον βαρεῖς, τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα καταγέφοντες ἐν δὲ ταῖς αἰθρίαις πάχνην ἐπιφέροντες καὶ πάγον[r]. There was a solar eclipse August 10 at 0.30 A. M. Paris, B. C. 68; on the first of Ab, according to our Tables, the same year: from which we may infer that the moon would be at the full about September 22 or 23, only one or two days before the autumnal equinox, Sept. 25; and that this change of weather probably set in about the next new moon, October 8.

In consequence of this state of the weather, as well as the appearance of a disorderly spirit among his troops, who were now beginning to refuse to follow him any further, the plans of Lucullus for the rest of the campaign were altered; and

[p] xxxv. 4. [q] Lucullus, xxxi. Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, lxxxvii. Fragmenta Sallustii, ii. 108. lib. v. [r] Luc. xxxii.

instead of continuing his route to Artaxata, in the midst of the bleak and winterly regions of Armenia, he marched into the warmer climate of Mesopotamia, and there laid siege to Nisibis: the beginning of which would thus probably fall still in the month of October. The statement of Dio at least, that the siege began Ἐν τῷ θέρει[s], must be in error. Plutarch says it was reduced Ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ[s]: Dio that the siege lasted until the beginning of winter[s]. And both statements would be consistent if it began to be besieged towards the end of October, and was actually reduced soon after the beginning of November; which was ordinarily reckoned in these times to be the beginning of winter also.

But Dio adds[t] that it was taken at last not only at the beginning of winter, but on a night when there was no moon; and in the midst of a violent storm of thunder and rain: which in our opinion is a clear intimation of the first setting in of the rainy season; the prelude to which, (as we should be able to prove by actual examples of the fact,) in these quarters was almost always a natural phenomenon of this kind: easily accounted for by the long droughts and continued heat of the summer in the same parts. And the usual time of the occurrence of this change of the weather, and so ushered in, was the first or second week in November also. The new moon of November B. C. 68 may be assumed as about the 6th of that month. And about this time we should date the capture of Nisibis, on one of the nights of the *silent* moon; three days before the end of the preceding moon, Nov. 3—6, or three days after the beginning of this, Nov. 6—9.

SECTION X.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 22. 378 *days.*

U. C. 687 Varr. 686 Cap. 684 Polyb. B. C. 67.

C. Calpurnius Piso
M'. Acilius Glabrio.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 21 B. C. 67. Nundinal Char. 7.

On the last day of this year, by the contrivance of the tri-

[s] Ibid. xxxv. 6: cf. 7. Cf. Appian, Mithridatica, lxxxvii. Plutarch, Lucullus, xxxii. [t] xxxv. 6, 7. Cf. Eutropius, vi. 7.

bune Manilius, a law was passed to give the Libertini the privilege of voting in the same tribes as their patrons: Μετὰ τῶν ἐξελευθερωσάντων [u].

The observable circumstance for the illustration of the calendar is that the tribune, having previously got together a number of supporters Ἐκ τοῦ ὁμίλου, both proposed and carried his measure *on* this day Πρὸς ἑσπέραν. We look upon this as an intimation that, on the last day of U. C. 687 Dec. 29 Roman, the moon was very probably at or about the full; so as to allow a measure of this kind to be proposed and carried even after sunset, and even at this season of the year, without any impediment from the dark.

There can be no uncertainty about the year. The νουμηνία, new year's day, or Kalends of January, of the next year, when Æmilius Lepidus and Lucius Tullus (consuls of U. C. 688 B. C. 66) entered on office, is distinctly mentioned [w]. Manilius himself would enter on the tribuneship iv Idus Decembres U. C. 687 February 14 B. C. 66. The last day of U. C. 687 (Dec. 29 Roman) would be March 5 B. C. 66. There was a lunar eclipse January 8 at 1. 30 P. M. Paris previously. Consequently the moon would be again at the full on or about March 8; only three days after March 5, the last day of the preceding year. The fact then must have been as we conjecture. There would be light even after sunset Pridie Kal. Januarias U. C. 687. It is clear from the context of Dio [w] that neither this day nor the day before it was a Nundinal day. December 26 Roman U. C. 687 was Nundinal, but not December 28 nor 29.

[u] Dio, xxxvi. 25: cf. xxxv. 12: xxxvi. 21. 24. Livy, xlix.

[w] Dio, xxxvi. 25.

SECTION XI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 23. 355 *days.*

U. C. 688 Varr. 687 Cap. 685 Polyb. B. C. 66.

M. Æmilius Lepidus
L. Volcatius Tullus.

Kalendæ Januariæ March 6 B. C. 66. Nundinal Char. 5.

i. *On the date of the appointment of Pompey to supersede Lucullus: and on that of the battle by night with Mithridates.*

The Lex Manilia was passed this year; appointing Pompey to the command of the war with Mithridates *extra ordinem*, not only over the head of Lucullus, but over that of Marcius, consul of U. C. 686 B. C. 68; and over that of Acilius, consul of U. C. 687 B. C. 67: of neither of whom had the proper term of the proconsular command yet expired when Pompey was thus commissioned to supersede them[x].

It appears from Plutarch's account of the proceedings of Lucullus subsequently to the point of time down to which we last brought them, (Nov. B. C. 68,) that his soldiers continued to render him a precarious obedience up to the end of the summer quarter of the next year (Θέρους λήγοντος) B. C. 67[y]; when they absolutely refused to follow him any longer. From this time consequently, having lost all control over them, he was compelled to remain in total inactivity. It was already known at Rome before the Lex Manilia was passed, (i. e. in B. C. 66,) that he had dismissed part of his troops, (those whose term of service had expired,) and had delivered up part of the remainder to Acilius Glabrio, consul of the preceding year[z]. It is agreed that Pompey and he after this first met in Galatia[a]; and from the anecdote mentioned by Plutarch[a] about the laurels with which the fasces of Pompey

[x] Dio, xxxvi. 25: cf. 26. 28: xxxv. 2. 14. 17. Plutarch, Pompeius, xxx. xxxi: Lucullus, xxxiii—xxxvi. Livy, c. ci. Vell. Pater. ii. 33. Appian, Mithridatica, xc. xcvii. Cicero, Oratio xiii. Pro Lege Manilia. Zonaras, x. 4. 476 C.

[y] xxxiii. xxxiv. xxxv. xxxvi. Cf. Dio, xxxvi. 8–12. 14. 15. Livy, xcviii.

[z] Cicero, Oratio xiii. Pro Lege Manilia, 9, 26: cf. 2, 5.

[a] Lucullus, xxxvi. Pompeius, xxxi. Velleius Pat. ii. 33: Dio, xxxvi. 29.

were wreathed as faded and dried at the time, while those of Lucullus were green and fresh; we may infer that they met in the summer: and probably towards the end of the summer, about the beginning of August.

The proceedings of Pompey therefore against Mithridates, after he had assumed the command, may be dated from this period of the natural year, B. C. 66. And though we cannot undertake to define the dates of all, nor indeed is it necessary that we should; yet there was one among them, a battle between him and Mithridates by night, in which the latter sustained a signal defeat [b], the actual time of which may perhaps be determined.

It is clearly to be collected from the different accounts of this battle that it began about midnight; and that there was a moon at the time, and shining in such a manner that its light was in the face of the soldiers of Mithridates and on the backs of the Romans. But Plutarch and Zonaras (the latter no doubt after Plutarch) speak of this moon as if it was just setting; and that would imply a moon 7 or 8 days old. Dio on the contrary and Orosius speak of it as rising at the time; and we are persuaded that such was the real truth of the case—that *this* moon actually rose, and did not actually set, at or about midnight, when this battle was going on: and consequently that its real age at the time was 22 or 23 days, not 7 or 8 only. It appears too from Plutarch and Zonaras that Pompey and Mithridates had been encamped over against each other for 45 days, before the latter began his retreat; in the course of which retreat Pompey having got in advance of him intercepted his march and forced him to this battle by night. And it appears further from Dio that Mithridates himself set out on this retreat *by night*, and for some time after marched chiefly by night: which in our opinion is a clear intimation that he began his retreat at or about the full of some moon.

Appian on the contrary supposes the two armies to have been encamped in presence of each other *fifty* days before Mithridates attempted to retreat; and yet he too represents

[b] Dio, xxxvi. 29—32. Plutarch, Pompeius, xxxii. Appian, Mithridatica, xcviii—ci. Livy, ci. Zonaras, x. 4. 476 D—477 B. Frontinus, ii. i. 12. Florus, iii. 5, 21—23. Eutropius, vi. 10. Orosius, vi. 4.

the retreat to have been begun by *night*, though the battle, which followed in the course of the retreat, according to him was fought by *day*: *two* days after the beginning of the retreat. At first sight therefore his account appears to differ materially from that of our other authorities; and yet there may be after all no real difference between his and theirs, except in this one circumstance of the battle's having been fought by day and not by night: in which supposition Appian must certainly have been mistaken. In every other respect but that, these different accounts would be reconcileable to one another, if the exact state of the case was *this*; That Mithridates began his retreat on the night of the 45th day since the armies had met; and that the battle was fought on the night of the seventh day of this retreat, the 52d day since the armies had met: for these seven days (the difference of 52 days and 45 days) are the sum total of the difference between the statement of Appian and that of Plutarch on this point. It will follow that as the night of the 52d day was that of the 22d or 23d moon; the night of the 45th must have been that of the 15th or 16th: and consequently that Mithridates, as we inferred from the account of Dio, must have begun his retreat at the full of the moon.

Now the new moons of B. C. 66, (reckoned from April 22 at midnight the new moon of Nisan that year,) which fell later than midsummer, were those of July 19, August 18, September 16, and October 16, respectively; as appears not only from our general Lunar Calendar Period xiii. Cycle xvi. 6, but also from the solar eclipse of December 14 at 1.45 P.M. Paris, the same year, which coincided with Chisleu 1 Dec. 14 of our Lunar Calendar. It is clear that the first of these dates, that of July 19, must have been too early for the epoch of any thing which was later than the meeting of Lucullus and Pompey at least. But that of August 18 would appear to be altogether suited to the conditions of the case, and to the course of subsequent circumstances. And this being assumed accordingly as the date of the time when Pompey and Mithridates came into the presence of each other; the night of the retreat of the former, the night of the 45th day after that, must have been the night of October 1, and the night of the full moon also: and the night of the battle, the night of

the seventh day of the retreat, must have been the night of October 8, when the moon would be 23 days old and rising at or about midnight, October 9. And this date is strongly confirmed by the testimony of Appian [c], who in little more than seven days after the battle and after the escape of Mithridates speaks of his *wintering* already at Dioscurias among the Colchi.

ii. *On the date of the Saturnalia, when Pompey was attacked by the Albani.*

It does not appear that Pompey continued his pursuit of Mithridates on this occasion further than the river Phasis [d]; and when he gave that up for the time he must have marched back again to the scene of the battle, in order to found the city of Nicopolis on the same locality: as he is said to have done in commemoration of the late victory [d].

The foundation of such a city would take up a considerable time: and, if it could scarcely have been begun before the third or fourth week in October, it might well detain Pompey until the end of November. It is agreed that he marched next to Artaxata, the capital of Tigranes [e]. And the distance from Nicopolis to that point not being less than 335 Roman miles direct = 377 by road, it could not be marched in much less than 30 days; so that if he did not set out from Nicopolis before the end of November he could not have arrived at Artaxata before the end of December.

He did not however winter at Artaxata; but continued his march beyond it to the regio 'Αναϊτὶς as Dio calls it [f]; as far as the river Cyrnus or Cyrus on the borders of Albania [g]: two hundred miles direct, and 225 by road, further than Artaxata. And here he must have gone into winter-quarters; and here he was still posted in winter-quarters when the Albanians, under their king Orœses or Orodes [h], attacked him there: and, as both Dio and Plutarch agree [h], on the Cronia or Sa-

[c] Mithridatica, ci.

[d] Dio, xxxvi. 33. Appian, Mithridatica, cv. Strabo, xii. 3. Orosius, vi. 4. Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. iv. 238. App. xix.

[e] Dio, xxxvi. 34–36. Plutarch, Pompeius, xxxiii. Livy, ci. Appian, Mithridatica, ciii–cv. Eutropius, vi. 11.

[f] xxxvi. 36. [g] Ibid. 37.

[h] Dio, xxxvi. 37: cf. xxxvii. 4. Plutarch, Pompeius, xxxiv. Appian, Mithridatica, ciii. Zonaras, x. iv. 477 D. Eutropius, vi. 11.

turnalia of the Roman calendar of the time, December 17—19 Roman; the Saturnalia at this period consisting of three days[i]. From which facts it follows that the Roman Saturnalia at this time must have been falling in the winter.

Our calendar shews that such was actually the case. All these events belong to one year, U.C. 688; the consular year of M. Æmilius Lepidus L. Volcatius Tullus: and in that year the stated date of the Saturnalia Prima, Dec. 17 Roman, fell on Feb. 11 B.C. 65; i.e. for such a climate as that of Albania, in the very depth of winter. We do not indeed know how long Pompey had been in winter-quarters before this attack. But if he did not arrive at Artaxata before the end of December B.C. 66, he could scarcely have transacted his business there, and afterwards marched in the winter more than two hundred miles, to the borders of Albania, much before the time thus indicated by our calendar; the end of January or the beginning of February, B.C. 65.

The time which appears to have been chosen by the Albanians for their attack is something remarkable. Our Lunar calendar shews the new moon of Sebat this year on February 11 at midnight, the date of the Saturnalia Prima; and that is confirmed by the solar eclipse of December 14 previously. The surprise of the Romans then was certainly attempted by these mountaineers on the day of the new moon, reckoned from the change or from the phasis, February 11—13, one of the three days of the Saturnalia; but whether because their calendar at this time was lunar, or because they purposely made choice of a dark night, we cannot undertake to say. It is not probable that *they* could have known any thing of the Roman custom of the Saturnalia; or have fixed on one of the days of that feast because they expected to find the Romans at such a time off their guard.

[i] Diss. v. ch. i. sect. viii. Vol. i. 450.

SECTION XII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vi. 24.378 *days.*

U. C. 689 Varr. U. C. 688 Cap. U. C. 686 Polyb. B. C. 65.

L. Aurelius Cotta
L. Manlius Torquatus.

Kalendæ Januariæ February 24 B. C. 65. Nundinal Char. 2.

i. *On the date of the conspiracy of* P. Autronius Pætus *and* P. Cornelius Sulla, U. C. 689 B. C. 65.

A fact has been recorded of the end of the preceding and of the beginning of this consular year with which certain dates have been connected in terms; and these it may be worth our while to consider. Publius Autronius Pætus and Publius Cornelius Sulla, according to Dio[k], having been candidates for the consulship at the last comitia, and though elected having been set aside on the charge of ambitus or bribery, and having been superseded by Cotta and Torquatus, who had been the means of their conviction; out of revenge, in conjunction with some others, formed a conspiracy to assassinate the two consules designati on the very day when they were to enter on office, the Kalends of January U. C. 689.

This conspiracy is mentioned by Sallust[l]: and from his account of it it appears that one of the ringleaders in it was Cn. Piso, who while in office was afterwards killed in Spain[k] in the administration of that province as Prætor, or on his way thither, by his own soldiers[k]: Cum hoc Catilina et Autronius...circiter Nonas Decembris (Lucio Tullo M. Lepido Coss.) consilio communicato parabant in Capitolio Kalendis Januariis L. Cottam et L. Torquatum consules interficere: ipsi fascibus correptis Pisonem cum exercitu ad obtinendas duas Hispanias mittere. ea re cognita, rursus in Nonas Februarii consilium cædis transtulerant ... quod ni Catilina maturasset pro curia signum sociis dare, eo die post conditam urbem Romam pessimum facinus patratum foret[m].

[k] xxxvi. 27: cf. Sallust, Bellum Cat. xviii: xix. Cicero, xix. In Catilin. i. 6, 15: xxiii. Pro Murena, 38, 82: xxv. Pro P. Sulla, 24, 68. Asconius, P. 110: 111: 117 In Orat. in Toga Cand. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, ix. 1. Livy, ci.

[l] Loc. cit.

[m] Bell. Cat. xviii. Cf. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, ix. 6.

The thing to be observed here is that in the opinion of these conspirators the Kalends of January U. C. 689 and much less the Nones of February the same year were not too early in the natural year to despatch Piso with an army to Spain. The former fell February 24, the latter March 28, B. C. 65. The character of the year too being 2 the Nones of February were Nundinal: and that might have something to do with the choice of this day in the second instance, because of the greater crowd and bustle, and consequently confusion, which it might be expected there would be at the time. *This* was probably the reason why they fixed the attempt at first for the day of the ingress, January 1 Roman; and probably too why, as we learn from Cicero [n], Catiline once thought of executing the attempt on the day before the Kalends, the last day of the official year, the day of the Ejuratio: which was almost as great an occasion as the day of the ingress *. Or the reason why they fixed on the Nones of February at last might be simply because there was a stated sacrifice and ceremony on that day in *arce*, i. e. in the Capitol [o]; at which the consuls perhaps were bound to be present.

ii. *On the date of the birth, and on the Horoscope or Genitura, of Horace.*

There is another date also on record, which belongs to this year, and is calculated to give it an additional interest in the opinion of the classical student; that of the birth of Horace.

Natus est (Horatius) sexto Idus Decembres Lucio Cotta et Lucio Torquato consulibus: decessit quinto Kalendas Decembres Cajo Marcio Censorino Cajo Asinio Gallo consulibus, post nonum et quinquagesimum annum [p]. The former

* Why the Nones of December were fixed upon in the first instance does not appear; unless it was because, as the 10th of December Roman was the stated date of the ingress of the Tribuni Plebis, so the Nones or the 5th was that of the official ingress of the Plebeian Ædiles; cf. Cicero, In Verrem Actio i. 10, 30: though that of the ingress of the Curule Ædiles was the Kalends of January: cf. i. in Verr. 12, 36: 13, 37: ii. Lib. v. 14, 36. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, ix. 1.

[n] Orat. xix. In Catilin. i. 6, 15.
[o] Cf. supra, Vol. ii. 434.
[p] Suetonius, Vita, 15: 16. cf. Jerome, Thesaurus Temp. ad Olymp. clxxviii. 4: cxcii. 2.

of these years was U. C. 689, the latter was U. C. 746. In the former vi Idus Decembres December 8 Roman answered to February 14 B. C. 64: in the latter v Kalendas Decembres, November 27 Roman, answered to November 28 B. C. 8: so that in Roman time Horace was 56 years, eleven months, nineteen days old at his death; in Julian, (which only would represent his real age at the time,) he was 56 years, nine months, fourteen days old at his death. It is manifest therefore that Suetonius' statement of his age at the time, (59 years or even 60,) is in error; and could be true in any sense only, if we read in his text at present Post *septimum* et quinquagesimum annum. The same year was also that of the death of his friend and patron Mæcenas [q]; and probably somewhat earlier in the year: so that, as he himself declares he neither could nor would survive him, he actually did not do so except a very short time.

The year thus assigned to his birth is confirmed by his own testimony [r]; and that he was born in December appears also from his own testimony [s]. But with respect to the *day* in that month it rests entirely on the authority of Suetonius. In one of his Odes however there is an allusion to his Horoscope, or Genitura; which is calculated to throw some light even on this day.

> Seu Libra seu me Scorpius adspicit
> Formidolosus, pars violentior
> Natalis horæ, seu tyrannus
> Hesperiæ Capricornus undæ [t].

From which we might infer that he considered himself to have been born when one of these signs, Libra, Scorpius, or Capricorn, was in the ascendant; though he did not exactly know which, or which in particular more than either of the other two. The scholiast construed this allusion as if it meant that he was destined to be shortlived; and therefore was born under Scorpio: Infestus enim fertur Scorpius

[q] Dio, lv. 7. 5: 8. Cf. Suetonius, Vita, 17.

[r] Od. iii. xxi. 1. Epod. xiii. 8. Epp. i. xx. 27. Cf. Od. ii. iv. 22: iii. xiv. 25: iv. i. 4.

[s] Epod. xiii. 8: xi. 7: Epp i. xx 27.

[t] Od. ii. xvii. 17.

præ aliis genesi juxta Mathesim: idcirco dicunt physici qui sub Scorpio nascitur cito moritur. But this was evidently a precarious inference from his own words at least; which do not more necessarily imply that he was born under Scorpio than under Libra or under Capricorn. Besides which a Genitura or Horoscope which extended from Libra to Capricorn must have included Sagittarius also; to which no allusion, for some reason or other, occurs in the preceding passage.

In fact it is scarcely conceivable that a particular horoscope, which in the proper astrological sense of the term [u] was always connected with some *one* degree of some *one* sign, and with some *one* instant of time, (that of the rising above the horizon of that *one* degree of that *one* sign,) could be supposed to extend in any sense over three or four signs in succession, each of them requiring two hours at least to rise, except on *one* hypothesis; viz. that of a protracted birth or parturition, which might have begun when the first of those signs was in the ascendant but was over only when the last was so. Such cases of a difficult and tedious delivery are liable to occur; and that of Horace's mother, it appears to us, must have been one of the number.

We may assume that the latitude and meridian of Horace's birthplace were those of the ancient Venusia; a colony planted between U. C. 459 and U. C. 463 [v], B. C. 295 and B. C. 291.

Lucanus an Appulus anceps:
Nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus [w].

And the latitude of the ancient Venusia according to D'Anville was 41° N. Assuming then also that Horace was actually born at Venusia, on February 14, B. C. 64, we have calculated the time of sunrise for that latitude and that day; and found it Feb. 14, about 7 h. 8 m. 56 s. A. M. apparent time, exclusive of refraction: and the sun's true place at that time for the same meridian was about 323° 22′ 19″—i. e. the 24° of Aquarius; which according to the received division of the sphere in 8vis Partibus would probably be reckoned the 2° of

[u] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, iii. 453: 458 note.

[v] Vell. Pat. i. 14.

[w] Sermon. ii. i. 34.

Pisces. And if we may also assume that each of these signs would take up in rising as below *, we should have the

			h.	m.	s.	
2° Pisces	Rising	Feb. 14 at	7	8	56	from midnight
2° Aquarius	..	.. 14 ..	5	40	1	..
2° Capricorn	..	.. 14 ..	3	39	35	..
2° Sagittarius	..	Feb. 14 ..	1	12	12	..
2° Scorpio	..	.. 13 ..	22	37	24	..
2ª Libra	..	.. 13 ..	20	4	14	..

We may conjecture consequently that the labour of Horace's mother began Feb. 13—between 20 h. 4 m. 14 s. from midnight and 22 h. 37 m. 24 s. from midnight, while Libra was in the ascendant; and was protracted until Feb. 14 5 h. 40 m. 1 s. from midnight—when Capricorn was still in the ascendant; and that the most critical period of the labour was from Feb. 13, at 22 h. 37 m. 24 s., when Scorpio began to be in the ascendant, to Feb. 14, at 1h. 12m. 12s. when Sagittarius began to be so; so that he was truly born at last in Capricorn, but might be said to have begun to be born in Libra, and was at one time expected to have been born in Scorpio, when the labour of the parturition was probably the greatest: which would explain why he should describe that sign in particular as the

Pars violentior
Natalis horæ.

SECTION XIII.—*On the administration of the Irregular Calendar through the sixth Cycle in general.*

With regard to the administration of the calendar through this cycle in general something has been already said[x]. The Pontifex Maximus all this time was the same individual, Q.

B. C. 64 latitude of Rome.

Degrees of the Ecliptic.		h.	m.	s.
174° to 204°	Rising in	2	33	10
204 .. 234	..	2	34	48
234 .. 264	..	2	27	23
264 .. 294	..	2	0	26
294 .. 324	..	1	28	55

The above calculations were made by Mr. Adams, and for the latitude of Rome.

[x] Supra, 297.

Metellus, and he seems to have adhered, as closely as circumstances would permit, to *one* rule; that of having common and intercalary years alternately. The number of intercalary years in the whole of this cycle was only three more than that of common.

Besides however the case already noticed of four intercalary years in succession, B. C. 81–78; we have two in succession, B. C. 72 and B. C. 71. The former of these would be so according to rule; but why the latter was intercalary does not appear, unless it was made so in order to dispense with that of the next year, and so far to curtail its length. We collected from Cicero's testimony [y] that *this* year B. C. 70 *de facto* was common. We know too that it was the year of the first consulate of Pompey; in which he availed himself of the power and influence entailed by the office of consul to restore the Potestas Tribunicia; which had been either taken away by Sulla B. C. 80 or reduced merely to a name [z]: and that was no doubt a step which did not please the party of the *Optimates;* and if there was any reason to expect it beforehand, it might have been a sufficient inducement with the Pontifical college for abridging the length of the year. But after all, as U. C. 683 B. C. 71, was the last year of the war with Spartacus; it might have been purposely lengthened by a special intercalation, to give more time to Crassus, and to the rest associated with him in the command on that occasion.

Lastly there are some dates of triumphs, still on record, which fall within the limits of this cycle [a]. None of them offends against the rule of the Nundinal Incidence.

[y] Diss. vi. ch. i. sect. vi. Vol. i. 520.

[z] Cf. Livy, lxxxix. xcvii. Velleius Pat ii. 30. Plutarch, Pompeius, xxi. xxii. Appian, B. C. i. 100. 121. Sallust, Bell. Cat. 39. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, v. 1. Cicero, Actio i. in Verr. 15, 16. ii. Lib. v. 63, 163. 68, 175: De Legibus, iii. 9, 22. Asconius, P. 5, 6. In Orat. De Divin.: 40, In iii Contra Verrem.

[a] Vol. ii. 90, 91.

DISSERTATION XVIII.

On the Verification of the Irregular Roman Calendar. Cycle vii.

CHAPTER I.

Section I.—*Importance of this Cycle.*

The seventh cycle of the Irregular Calendar is the most important which we have to consider; indeed almost the most important period of the whole Roman calendar: because it immediately precedes the Julian correction. The nineteenth year of this cycle was the year of the correction, the year of confusion as it has been called; and the first year of the Æra Juliana properly so called, B. C. 45 itself, may be reckoned the 20th year of the viith cycle of the Irregular Calendar previously in use.

For this reason, there is no part of this period of the irregular administration of the calendar in general, which it is more essential to our proper purpose that we should verify and confirm with the utmost exactness. We shall therefore make a point of demonstrating if possible the truth of our Fasti Romani for almost every year of this cycle; especially as we draw nearer to the time of the Julian correction. And it is a fortunate, or (to speak more becomingly) it is a *Providential*, coincidence that the materials or data requisite for this proof are supplied to our hand in abundance. In no period of contemporary Roman history are so many dates extant as in this; so much so that the difficulty and embarrass-

ment under which we feel ourselves placed, when preparing to treat of this part of our subject, is not to *discover* proofs but to *select* them.

Under these circumstances, it is far from improbable, that as we proceed with our task we shall find ourselves obliged to omit and pass over almost as much matter of this kind as we shall be seen to adduce; and we wish the reader to understand beforehand that if the principles and arrangements of the Irregular Period, adopted and proposed in our calendar, in his opinion have been satisfactorily established up to the beginning of this last portion of the whole; there is nothing to fear for the remainder of its details through this. The truth of our calendar for this last cycle in particular would be a certain fact, (placed out of question by proofs of its own, entirely independent of any thing of the same kind which precedes it,) though nothing had been demonstrated and nothing had even been known of any part of the same period before it.

SECTION II.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 2. 378 *days.*

U. C. 691 Varr. 690 Cap. 688 Polyb. B. C. 63.

M. Tullius Cicero
C. Antonius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 26 B. C. 63. Nundinal Char. 5.

i. *On the* Genitura *or* Horoscope *of Augustus. Year of the birth of Augustus.*

The truth of our calendar for this year was illustrated in part i. By the date of the lunar eclipse at the Feriæ Latinæ of the year, May 3; and ii. By the date of the opposition of Jupiter, at the beginning of the year, April 17[b]. But neither of these proofs went any further than the demonstration of the *general* accuracy of our calendar for that particular year. There is still one proof, capable of being adduced, which will illustrate and verify its details; and to the explanation of this we shall now proceed.

This proof is derived from the Genitura or Horoscope of the emperor Augustus. The first thing necessary is to ascer-

[b] Supra, p. 14 sqq.

tain the *year* of his birth; and this, it is agreed, was the consular year of Cicero and Antonius, U. C. 691 of Varro, and therefore, in the style of the Æra Vulgaris, B. C. 63. Consulatui Ciceronis non mediocre adjecit decus natus eo anno D. Augustus abhinc annos lxxxii[c]— Καὶ γὰρ ἐκ τύχης αὐτῷ γεγονέναι συμβεβήκει Κικέρωνος ὑπατεύοντος[d]— Natus est Augustus M. Tullio Cicerone et Antonio consulibus[e]. On this point there can be no doubt.

ii. *Day of the Birth of Augustus; and on the Roman style of that day before and after the Julian Correction.*

The next question is that of the *day* of his Birth; and for this it may suffice at present to quote only the testimony of Suetonius[e]. Natus est Augustus M. Tullio Cicerone et Antonio consulibus ix Kalendas Octobris.

There can be no doubt that, according to every testimony to that point which has come down to posterity, the date thus assigned by Suetonius is the formal or recognized date of the birth. It is that which still appears in the extant remains of the Julian calendar[f], some of them almost as old as the time of Augustus himself: and in various inscriptions on marbles of equal antiquity[g]. And yet it may very well be doubted whether this was actually the Roman date of his birth from the first.

In the first place it is to be observed that he was born before the Julian correction; and, if he was born in the Roman September, that month before the correction had 29 days, and after it had 30 days: and the *one* day which made this difference in its length before and after the correction was the iii Kalendas Octobres[h]; and consequently came between the day of his birth and the end of the month. It follows that before the Julian correction, and while September had only 29 days, the ix Kalendas Octobres must

[c] Vellcius Paterculus, ii. 36. The text of Velleius in this reading of lxxxii is corrupt. It should be lxxxxii (92 not 82). For, as his epoch is U. C. 783, it is manifest that U. C. 691 and U. C. 783 must have been 92 years asunder.

[d] Plutarch, Cicero, xliv.

[e] Suetonius, Vita, v. 1: cf. xxxi. 2.

[f] As the Maffæan, Capranic, Pincian. Cf. also the Constantian calendar.

[g] Gruter, ccxxviii. 8: ccxxix. 1. Donius, p. 62. ii. 5: 348. ix. 28. Cf. Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, iii. No. 3902. 3957. Cf. Suetonius, Augustus, lvii. 3: lxxxii. 3: ci. 5. Velleius Pat. ii. 65.

[h] Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. xiv. 270.

have denoted the 22nd of that month; after it, and when September had now 30 days, it must have denoted the 23rd of that month.

The next question then will be whether the birthday of Augustus was always one and the same day of the month? and always the 23rd of the month? For if it was, its nominal date in the Roman style before and after the Julian correction respectively must have been different. It must have been the viii Kalendas Octobres before the correction, and the ix Kalendas Octobres after it.* And on this question, it appears to us, there can be only *one* opinion; viz. that Augustus' birthday was always the same day of the month: that he was actually born on the 23rd of the Roman September; and that no other day in that month ever was, or ever with propriety could have been, recognized as the date of his birth. Τῇ γὰρ τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου ἐγεγένητο, says Dio[1]: and he might so express himself advisedly, instead of in the usual style of Τῇ πρὸ ἐννέα Καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων, knowing the ambiguity to which dates in the proper Roman style in certain cases before and after the Julian correction were liable; though it must be admitted that this use in Dio of the modern mode of designating days of the month, instead of the more classical and properly Roman style in such cases, is not peculiar to this date of the birthday of Augustus.

If however the recognized date of the birth of Augustus was always the 23rd of the Roman September, it follows that in consequence of the Julian correction its nominal date must have been changed; and that, if it was the ix Kalendas Octobres after the correction, it must have been the viii Kalendas Octobres before it. To this conclusion it may perhaps be objected that in other cases of this kind, wherein a given date in the Roman calendar before and after the Julian correction was concerned, we have assumed that the nominal date was always the same; and therefore that the actual date must have been different. Here we are assuming that the actual date continued the same, and that the nominal underwent a change. The date of the Palilia for example was always the same in terms, xi Kalendas Maias; but the proper

[1] lvi. 30: lv. 6: xlv. 4.

meaning of xi Kalendas Maias before the Julian correction was April 20 Roman, and after it was April 21.

To this objection we reply that, in all such cases as these, if the nominal date remained the same as before, the actual date denoted by it must have become different; and in such cases as this of the Palilia there can be no question that the nominal date would remain the same after the Julian correction as much as before it. It was confirmed by too long a prescription to be disturbed. The common people were too familiar with it and too much attached to it to allow any other to be substituted for it. We are informed that this was one of the points in the details of his correction to which Julius Cæsar was scrupulously attentive; viz. not to change any of the dates of the religious or liturgic calendar, any of the solemn and stated *feriæ*, in appearance at least, even while he was changing them in reality: and in this scruple he was no doubt deferring to the prejudices of the common people, who neither could nor would have recognized any of their old observances, not even the Natalis Urbis itself, except under their old and familiar names.

But with respect to questions of a private nature, which would necessarily arise out of the correction of the calendar, such as the birthdays of particular individuals, and their proper style after as well as before the correction, the case would be different. It must have been self-evident to all the contemporaries of the correction that their proper birthdays, according to the usual style and notation of such days in the calendar, in repeated instances, by virtue of the correction had undergone a change; they were not and could not be the same day as before. In some instances they must have been one day, and in some they must have been even two days, different from what they had been before; at least if they were nominally still the same. Suppose a particular birthday for example before the correction to have fallen in Sextilis, or August, on the Vulcanalia, the x Kalendas Septembres: this calendar date before the correction denoted the 21st of the month; after it, it meant the 23rd. We cannot suppose that those who were living at the time could not have been aware of such distinctions as these. It is easy to see that very important questions might depend upon them,

affecting the rights of property, and political privileges; whatsoever in short was connected by law with the *age* of particular individuals strictly defined and strictly understood. Nor can we suppose that such questions, and so likely to arise out of the correction, would not be foreseen by Julius Cæsar; nor that if he foresaw and anticipated them he would not provide against them by some general rule or other. In which case, since nothing is known of any such constitution from testimony, and we have been left entirely to conjecture concerning it, there is no reason why we should not suppose that the actual direction and constitution, intended to meet this particular case of the legal computation of ages before and after the correction, was that which was most obviously dictated by common sense; viz. that it should follow the same rule as before: that, whatsoever had been the nominal style of a particular birthday before the correction, for all legal intents and purposes it should still be considered and treated as the same after it.

It is manifest however that a person of so much consequence as the emperor Augustus would not be bound by any such rule as the rest of the Romans, if he himself did not think proper to be so; or if there were special reasons in his case, to make it necessary that the real distinction between the same nominal date before and after the correction of the calendar should be taken strictly into account. Now there were such reasons in *his case:* reasons supplied by his Horoscope or Genitura itself. It was essential to his Horoscope to continue attached to the actual date of his birth. Its entire nature must have been changed by changing the day of his birth. The judicial astrology of the time did not allow the characters of one day to be thus transferred to another; and a nativity cast according to such principles, under the circumstances of the case, for the 22nd of September could not possibly have agreed to the 23rd; or vice versa.

For this reason then, more than for any other, we must infer that whatsoever might be the case with the birthdays of individuals generally, and with their proper style in the calendar before and after the Julian correction; in that of the emperor Augustus, the real day must always have been kept in view, and always have been taken into account. Conse-

quently that, if it was the 23rd of September after the correction, it was the 23rd of September before it also: and therefore that if its style in the calendar, after the correction, was the ix Kalendas Octobres, before the correction it must have been the viii Kal. Octobres. It is no difficulty that all the actual dates of his birth, still extant and in the proper Roman style, run in the form of ix Kalendas Octobres. They are all later than the Julian correction, when that became *de facto* its true and proper style; if the day intended by it was always the 23rd of the month*.

iii. *Testimonies to the Horoscope of Augustus; and to his having been born in* Capricorn.

The actual date then of the birthday of Augustus being determined to the 23d of September Roman, U. C. 691; we proceed to observe that according to the accounts of the ancients his Horoscope was some time or other very strictly and carefully calculated. Suetonius tells of an occasion[k] when both his nativity and that of Agrippa were cast by Theagenes, a celebrated astrologer of the day, while they were

* Scaliger, De Emendatione, v. 440 D, speaking on this subject of the birthday of Augustus and of its proper style in the Roman calendar, has the following statement. At in forma veteri viii Kal. (i. e. not ix Kal. but viii Kal. Octobres); itaque in fragmento Kalendarii Romani sub monte Trinitatis effosso e regione xxiv Septembris exaratum est Merc. Fer. Ex S. C. quod is dies Imp. Cæsar. Natalis est. The Pincian fragment is meant. In Foggini the entry in question, in that calendar, stands opposite to the ix Kal. Octobres, not to the viii Kal. Octobres.

It is more to the purpose to observe that in a letter of Augustus himself, (preserved in A. Gellius, xv. 7,) written to his grandson Caius Cæsar (at that time absent in the East), and on his birthday, just when he had completed his 63rd year or grand climacteric, this date of viii Kalendas Octobres for his birthday occurs, and not ix Kalendas Octobres. We cannot indeed assume the integrity of the text of the Noctes Atticæ in this instance; as viii Kal. and viiii were so liable to be confounded, and MSS. are in existence in which the reading is ix Kal. Oct. not viii Kal. Oct. And yet it is very conceivable that Augustus (who was extremely superstitious about such things), knowing that the original date of his birthday in the calendar had been viii Kal. Octobres, in his private and most confidential correspondence, like this with his grandson, might choose so to date it still.

[k] Vita, xciv. 22. 23. 24.

at Apollonia; and if so, some time in the course of the first six months after the death of Julius Cæsar, when Cæsar Octavianus, as he was called at that time, and we may presume Agrippa, were actually both at Apollonia[l].

It appears from Dio also[m] that Augustus some time or other published his own Horoscope: *Καίτοι οὕτως οὐδὲν τῷ Αὐγούστῳ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔμελεν ὥστε καὶ ἐκ προγραφῆς πᾶσι τὴν τῶν ἀστέρων διάταξιν ὑφ' ὧν ἐγεγέννητο φανερῶσαι.* Suetonius attests this also, adding that he was born in Capricorn[k]: Tantam mox fiduciam fati Augustus habuit ut thema suum vulgaverit, numumque argenteum nota sideris Capricorni quo natus est percussit. And coins so struck by him with this impress are actually still in existence[n].

This circumstance of his nativity however, that he was born in Capricorn, does not rest on the testimony of Suetonius only; nor is he the oldest authority for it. It is attested by Manilius, who was writing in the lifetime of Augustus himself; between the date of the destruction of Varus and the legions in Germany U. C. 762 A. D. 9 and that of the death of Augustus U. C. 767 A. D. 14[o].

Contra Capricornus in ipsum *
Convertit visus. quid enim mirabitur ille
Majus? in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum[p].

It is confirmed by Germanicus Cæsar also; whose poetical version or paraphrase of Aratus, as this very testimony implies, must have been composed between U. C. 767 the year of the death of Augustus, and U. C. 772 in which he died himself[q].

Cochlidis inventor cum vis Titania flatu
Bellantem est mirata Jovem, pietatis honorem
Ut fuerat geminus forma sic sidera cepit.
Hic Auguste tuum genitali corpore numen
Attonitas inter gentes patriamque paventem
In cœlum tulit, et maternis reddidit astris[r].

---

* That is, In se ipsum.

[l] Dio, xlv. 3. Appian, B. C. iii. 9.
[m] lvi. 25.
[k] Loc. cit.
[n] Eckhel, Doctrina Namorum Vett. vi. 109.
[o] Astronomica, i. 894–901: cf. 904–924: i. 7–10: 391–392: 795–800: iv. 763–766: 934. 935.
[p] ii. 507.
[q] Tacitus, Annales, ii. 72. 59.
[r] Ver. 549: 1—16.

For that Pan or Capricorn is meant in this allusion follows not only from the double form, (that of the goat, and that of the human figure,) but also from the invention ascribed to him, that of the Cochlis, or Trumpet of shell; which the mythology of antiquity referred to Pan, in the war of the Gods and Titans. Οὗτος δὲ (sc. Capricorn as the same with Pan) δοκεῖ εὑρεῖν τὸν κόχλον, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς συμμάχους καθώπλισε, διὰ τὸ τοῦ ἤχου πανικὸν καλούμενον· ὃ οἱ Τιτᾶνες ἔφευγον[s].

iv. *On the* Regia Genitura *ascribed to Augustus.*

It appears further from Suetonius[t], (if the truth of the statement may be depended on,) that in the year of the birth of Augustus something of the nature of a prodigy occurred at Rome, which was interpreted to imply that the birth of a king was at hand. Auctor est Julius Marathus, ante paucos quam nasceretur menses prodigium Romæ factum publice, quo denuntiabatur regem populo Romano naturam parturire: Senatum exterritum censuisse ne quis illo anno genitus educaretur: eos qui gravidas uxores haberent quo ad se quisque spem traheret curasse ne senatus consultum ad ærarium deferretur. Both he at least and Dio record an anecdote, from which it appears that he was supposed to have had a Regia Genitura; that from the moment of his birth the stars had destined him to be a king.

Somniavit et pater Octavius utero Atiæ jubar solis exortum. quo natus est die cum de Catilinæ conjuratione ageretur in curia, et Octavius ob uxoris puerperium serius adfuisset, nota ac vulgata res est P. Nigidium comperta moræ caussa ut horam quoque partus acceperit affirmasse dominum terrarum orbi natum[u]—Ἄρτι τε ὁ παῖς ἐγεγέννητο, καὶ Νιγίδιος Φίγουλος βουλευτὴς παραχρῆμα αὐτῷ τὴν αὐταρχίαν ἐμαντεύσατο. ἄριστα γὰρ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν τήν τε τοῦ πόλου διακόσμησιν καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀστέρων διαφορὰς, ὅσα τε καθ' ἑαυτοὺς γιγνόμενοι καὶ ὅσα συμμίγνυντες ἀλλήλοις ἔν τε ταῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀποστάσεσιν ἀποτελοῦσι, διέγνω, . . . οὗτος οὖν τότε τὸν Ὀκταούϊον βραδύτερον ἐς τὸ συνέδριον διὰ τὸν τοῦ παιδὸς τόκον (ἔτυχε γὰρ βουλὴ οὖσα) ἀπαντήσαντα ἀνήρετο διὰ τί ἐβράδυνε; καὶ μαθὼν

[s] Eratosthenes, Καταστερισμοί, cap. 27: cf. Hyginus Poeticon Astronomicon xxviii.

[t] Cf. Vita, xliv. 3: lxxix.

[u] Vita, xciv. 6.

τὴν αἰτίαν ἀνεβόησεν ὅτι Δεσπότην ἡμῖν ἐγέννησας. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκταραχθέντα ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ διαφθεῖραι τὸ παιδίον ἐθελήσαντα ἐπέσχεν, εἰπὼν ὅτι Ἀδύνατόν ἐστι τοιοῦτόν τι αὐτὸ παθεῖν. τότε μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' ἐλέχθη[w] *.

* Publius Nigidius Figulus, mentioned in the preceding anecdote, in the opinion of the Romans of his own times and of after-times also passed for the most learned of their countrymen next to Varro; and in some respects was thought to be superior even to Varro.

Nigidius Figulus, homo ut ego arbitror juxta M. Varronem doctissimus [1] — M. Varronem et P. Nigidium, viros Romani generis doctissimos [2] — P. Nigidii .... quem M. Cicero ingenii doctrinæque nomine summe reveritus est [3] — Ætas M. Ciceronis et C. Cæsaris præstanti facundia viros paucos habuit: doctrinarum autem multiformium variarumque artium quibus humanitas erudita est columina habuit M. Varronem et P. Nigidium. sed Varronis quidem monumenta rerum ac disciplinarum quæ per litteras condidit in propatulo frequentique usu feruntur. Nigidianæ autem commentationes non proinde in vulgus exeunt: et obscuritas subtilitasque earum tamquam parum utilis derelicta est. sicuti sunt quæ paullo ante legimus in commentariis ejus quos Grammaticos inscripsit [4] — Nigidius autem solus est post Varronem: licet Varro præcellat in theologia hic in communibus litteris: nam uterque utrumque scripserunt [5]. In astronomy at least, (or rather astrology,) he was allowed to be *Facile princeps* among his contemporaries; for which reason he is the person whom Lucan introduces, at the beginning of his Pharsalia, forecasting from the positions and aspects of the planets and of the rest of the heavenly bodies the impending calamities of the war.

> At Figulus, cui cura deos secretaque cœli
> Nosse fuit, quem non stellarum Ægyptia Memphis
> Æquaret visu, numerisque moventibus astra,
> Aut hic errat ait &c. [6]

An absurd story is on record of the reason for which he obtained the surname of Figulus, which properly means a Potter. But though it is referred to by Augustin [7] and others we need not hesitate to reject it. The surname of Figulus was much older than his time. We learn from Jerome, in Chronico, that in philosophy Nigidius belonged to the sect of the Pythagoreans, as Varro on the contrary did to the Academy: and that was probably the reason why Cicero dedicated to his memory his translation of the Timæus of Plato [8], the idea of which seems to have been suggested by their meeting at Ephesus on some occasion when Nigidius was returning from Asia Ex legatione, and Cicero was going to Cilicia;

1 A. Gellius, iv. 9. 2 iv. 16. 6 i. 639: cf. 658–665.
3 xi. 11. 4 xix. 14. 7 De Civitate, v. 3.
5 Servius, ad Æn. x. 175. 8 Fragm. p. 1127.

* Dio, xlv. 1: cf. Zonaras, x. 13. 494 B. C.

This fact then being assumed that the horoscope of Augustus was such as on the principles of the received astrology implied that he was destined to be a king; then the fact already ascertained from testimony that he was born in Capricorn must have been connected in some manner or other with this destination. It must have been understood that those who were born in Capricorn were destined to be kings. Julius Firmicus, a writer on the judicial astrology of antiquity, of the age of the second Christian emperor, Constantius, shews accordingly that these two things were connected. But first of all it is necessary to explain what was meant by the horoscope in a particular instance. And this we shall do in his own words.

Ortus est pars horoscopi quæ in omnis genituræ tempore ab orientali parte primum emergit, ac per triginta deinceps partes educitur, quæ a Græcis Ἀνατολὴ appellatur[x]—Primus est locus, id est illa pars in qua horoscopus est constitutus. in hoc loco vita hominum et spiritus continetur. ex hoc loco totius genituræ fundamenta nascuntur. hic locus ab ea parte in qua fuerit horoscopus vires suas per residuas partes

i. e. B. C. 51. He was certainly an intimate friend of Cicero's; and one of his constant counsellors in his consulate U. C. 691 B. C. 63: Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Κόϊντος ὁ ἀδελφὸς καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ἑταίρων Πόπλιος Νιγίδιος, ᾧ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα παρὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς ἐχρῆτο πράξεις[9]: and he was one of the senators, commissioned by Cicero to examine the Indices or informers against the conspirators[10]. A letter from Cicero to him is extant[11], which proves that he must always have been on the most intimate terms with him. Nigidius was then in banishment; from which we must infer that he shared in the misfortunes of Pompey and of the rest who embraced his side, from B. C. 48 to the death of Cæsar at least. We learn in fact from Jerome that he died in banishment, either B. C. 45 or 44: for in his Chronicon, Ad ann. 1972 Olymp. clxxxiii. 4, he has this entry: Nigidius Figulus, Pythagoreus et Magus, in exsilio moritur. And when Cicero wrote the Preface to his Timæus, (a fragment of which is still extant,) he appears to have been then dead. And as he refers to his Academica in this Preface; it was later than the Academica, written B. C. 45. We may conclude then that Nigidius died in B. C. 45.

9 Plutarch, Cicero, xx: cf. An Seni sit gerenda Respublica? xxvii.

10 Oratio xxv. Pro P. Sulla, 14, 41, 42.

11 Ad Fam. iv. 43.

[x] Lib. ii. cap. xviii. Genituræ Cardines.

triginta extendit. est autem cardo primus et totius genituræ compago atque substantia quæ reliquis aditum præbet[y].

It thus appears that though the horoscope, in the utmost extent of its meaning, was commensurate with a twelfth part of the ecliptic or zodiac, a space of 30 degrees, yet in its most proper and specific sense it was synonymous with a single degree; it meant some one part of the horoscope itself, the most important of all, because the hinge, the origin, the substance of all the 29 besides, which depended upon it: from which each of them derived not only its proper place in the order of succession, but even its proper power and virtue. In one word it was the first of the 30 degrees which went by the name of the horoscope in general. Now this being the case, if Augustus was born in Capricorn, and if he was supposed to have been born in Capricorn under such circumstances as to have had a *regia genitura,* to have been designated as a *future king* by the power and virtue of his horoscope itself; we must necessarily infer both that it was understood he had been born in the first degree of Capricorn, and that those who were born in the first degree of Capricorn were predestinated thereby to be kings.

Firmicus confirms this inference also, by telling us subsequently that *such* was actually the peculiar significancy and virtue attached to the first degree of Capricorn in particular. Prima pars Capricorni si in horoscopo fuerit inventa *regem* faciet ac *principem,* et cui maxima conferantur insignia potestatis[z]: a description which accords so exactly to the case of Augustus as to leave no doubt that this particular degree of the ecliptic either actually was in the ascendant at the time of his birth, or actually was believed to have been so: and that it was this very coincidence itself which designated and pointed out his future fortunes from the moment of his birth, in a manner so remarkably verified by the event.

[y] Ibid. cap. xxii. De Locorum xii. potestatibus. Cf. our Fasti Catholici, iii. 453. 458 note.

[z] Lib. viii. cap. 28. p. 237. Partium Capricorni Myriogenesis.

v. *On the Julian date of the birthday of Augustus; and on the verification thereby of the tradition that he was born in Capricorn.*

It remains then that we should confirm these various conclusions by the testimony of the Julian date of his birth; and thereby also the truth of our calendar, from which only we obtain that date.

It is agreed that Augustus was born at Rome. Natus est Augustus .... regione Palatii ad capita bubula, ubi nunc sacrarium habet, aliquanto postquam excessit constitutum [a]. Servius tells us [b] that he was born Curiis veteribus, and was brought up In lautis Carinis; both localities in Rome. Testimony is uniform to the year of the event, in the æra of the city, U. C. 691; and the day, as we have seen, was always September 23 Roman. If so, the date of his birth must have been December 5 B. C. 63; according to our calendar at least: that being the Julian date of Sept. 23 Roman U. C. 691, Irregular calendar, Cycle vii. 2, which is shewn thereby. Suetonius adds [a] that the article of his birth was a little before sunrise: Paullo ante solis exortum. If so, a little before sunrise December 5; which for the meridian and latitude of Rome, and at this period, as we shall see by and by, would be about 7. 26 A. M. apparent time; exclusive of refraction.

But here an objection will probably occur to the reader, which at first sight will appear to be totally at variance with our preceding conclusions, and so far to be something serious. The nature of this may be explained as follows.

The mean date of the winter solstice B. C. 63 for the meridian of Rome was December 24, three or four hours after noon; and the true was December 23, two or three hours before midnight. It follows that at sunrise Dec. 5 for the same meridian the sun wanted 18 days and upwards of the winter solstitial point: and consequently, as its actual motion at this period of time, and at this season of the year, could not be estimated at less than a degree a day, its longitude Dec. 5

[a] Suetonius, Augustus, v. 1: and Vol. ii. 112. xlviii.
[b] Ad Æneid. viii. 361.

at sunrise must have been 18 degrees and upwards less than its longitude Dec. 23 at sunset; soon after which time on that day it would attain to the solstitial point. And as its longitude at the solstice (Dec. 23) would be ♐270°; its longitude, 18 days before, (Dec. 5,) would not be more than 270° —18°, i. e. than 252°. Consequently its true place, Dec. 5 at sunrise, would seem to have been the 12th degree of Sagittarius, not the first degree of Capricorn. And that being the case, it would appear to follow from it that Augustus, born a little before sunrise on the morning of December 5 this year, must have been born in the 12th degree of Sagittarius, not in the first degree of Capricorn.

In answer to this natural and apparently formidable objection, it is necessary to take into account the distinction between the ecliptic and the zodiac; and yet the connection of the one with the other: especially in the spheres of antiquity and in the astrology of antiquity.

The ecliptic circle on the sphere has a real existence, because it is the actual circle described by the sun in its annual course in the heavens; but it cannot be represented to the senses, and it must be regarded as a kind of mathematical line, (constantly passing through the centre of the sun,) which has length but not breadth. And this line, which constitutes the ecliptic circle in the heavens and the actual pathway of the sun in longitude, from the time of the first conception or first delineation of such a thing as the sphere[c], has always been divided into twelve equal spaces, called Δωδεκατημόρια, or signs, and into 360 equal spaces, called Μοῖραι, particulæ, or degrees; 30 of which go to every sign, and through one of which the sun moves on an average every day of the natural year. The zodiac on the other hand is a belt or zone of the sphere on either side of the ecliptic, that is, both north and south thereof; which has both length and breadth, both longitude and latitude: the limits of which in the first instance appear to have been assumed and defined upon certain arbitrary or positive principles, determined by the motions of the planets, not by that of the sun; but, on whatsoever principle assumed and laid down at first, have always *de facto* been the same: 8 degrees on one side of the ecliptic circle, and

[c] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, iii. 260. 253.

8 degrees on the other; 16 degrees in all. And the connection between the ecliptic and the zodiac, ever since both were delineated on the sphere together, is this: that every degree in longitude on the ecliptic was propagated also or extended, 8 degrees on one side and 8 degrees on the other side of itself, to the extreme limits of the zodiac in latitude. It follows that in all questions of this kind, which concern the sphere and the astrology of antiquity, not merely is longitude, as referrible to the ecliptic, but latitude also, as referred to the zodiac, to be taken into account.

Now as the actual path of the sun in the ecliptic passes exactly through the middle of the zodiac, and the breadth of the zodiac itself on either side of the ecliptic is so considerable: though no degree of the ecliptic can possibly rise *with* the sun *in* the ecliptic but that which the sun is occupying at the time; some other degree of the ecliptic (considered as propagated into the zodiac also and to the extreme limit of the zodiac to the north and the south of itself) more or less advanced than that, i. e. more or less to the east of it, will also be rising at the same time: though, because of the obliquity of the ecliptic, not always a degree at the same distance from the actual place of the sun, but one sometimes more sometimes less to the east of it.

It is also to be observed that, in connection with the astrological system of antiquity, its peculiar principles or assumptions in theory, and their proper application in practice, the natural or moveable sphere was not taken into account; only the fixed or immoveable one, to which, in our former work, we gave the name of the sphere of Mazzaroth. Nor was any attention paid to the sensible representations of the divisions even of this sphere, which we mean at present by the constellations, or zodiacal figures; only to the division and distinction of the signs in the abstract[c]. For these latter only were known to be fixed and invariable, and always the same with themselves; the former, it was well understood, were liable to be affected by precession, and to be constantly changing their relations to the latter. Again, it is still more strictly to be taken into account that, as the astrology of antiquity was purely and exclusively the invention of the

[c] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, iii. 461 : 466.

Chaldees; the astrological sphere properly so called was the Chaldaïc sphere, i. e. the Mazzaroth sphere of the Chaldees: and the relation of this to the natural or tropical sphere was such, as we have shewn in our former work [d], that the cardinal points in the former relatively to the latter all round the sphere fell ten degrees earlier; the first such point, the first of Krion, critically between 350° and 351°: the second, the first of Karkinon, critically between 80° and 81°; the third, or the first of Zygon, critically between 170° and 171°; the fourth, or the first of Ægon, critically between 260° and 261°.

Thirdly, it is most important of all to this particular question to take into account also the Chaldaïc doctrine respecting the alternate recession and advance of the cardinal points both in the sphere of Mazzaroth and in the tropical sphere; an explanation of which too was given in our former work [e]: and which may be further explained at a future period of the present work. This doctrine among the Chaldees appears to have been as old as their sphere and as old as their astrology itself; and consequently its date was that of both these, B. C. 1106. And in the purely Chaldaïc form of the doctrine, as opposed to the Egyptian and to the manner in which it was modified among the Egyptians in B. C. 798 [e], both the recession in antecedentia and the precession in consequentia were assumed to go on for ten degrees at a time, at the rate of one degree in 80 years, and of ten degrees in 800 years. That is, the supposed epoch of a given cardinal point in the sphere of Mazzaroth, (as the first of Ægon or Capricorn,) being 260°—261°, it was assumed that it would begin to recede on this point to the west, or in antecedentia, until it reached 250°—251°; and that then this motion in antecedentia would be reversed, and succeeded by a contrary motion to the east, or in consequentia: which would begin from 250°—251°, and go on at the same rate of one degree in 80 years until it again reached 260°—261°; and then that this motion in consequentia too would stop, and begin to be succeeded by the contrary motion in antecedentia: and thus that every thing would go on, for another cycle and alternation of this kind, as before.

[d] iii. 468. [e] Diss. xv. ch. vii. sect. v–vii. iii. 439–446: ch. viii. sect. i–vi. iii. 460–482: iii. 446, note: 475, note.

The first point then of Ægon in the Chaldaïc sphere of Mazzaroth, the astrological sphere properly so called, was critically 260°—261°. And this doctrine of the alternate recession and precession of that point, and of the rest of the cardinal points, having been invented along with the sphere in B. C. 1106, and the period of the recession and of the precession respectively having been assumed at 800 years exactly; it is evident that the first period of this kind must have come to an end B. C. 1106—800, i. e. B. C. 306: and that the epoch or locus of the first point of Ægon at that time must have been supposed to be critically 250°—251°. And the motion in antecedentia having reached its maximum in B. C. 306, and having begun to be succeeded by the contrary motion and at the same rate in consequentia; it is manifest that at the end of three periods of 80 years the amount of the precession must have been supposed to be three degrees exactly, and the locus or epoch of the first of Ægon, which B. C. 306 was critically 250°—251°, 240 years after, B. C. 66, must have been critically 253°—254°. And this comes so near to the year of the Birth of Augustus B. C. 63, that, if such was assumed to be its epoch B. C. 66, it must necessarily have been supposed to be still the same B. C. 63.

The epoch then of the first degree of Capricorn in the astrological sphere, the first of Ægon in the sphere of Mazzaroth, B. C. 63, was critically 254°; almost at the very beginning of that degree in the natural order of the motion in consequentia. These explanations therefore having been premised, we observe in the last place that the obliquity of the ecliptic for this period, B. C. 63, being assumed at 23° 42′, and the sun's true place in the ecliptic Dec. 5 that year, for the meridian of Rome, at sunrise being assumed at 251° 6′, and its declination at 22° 21′ S. it is found that the sun would be rising for the latitude of Rome, and this point of the ecliptic along with it, at 7 h. 26 m. 35 s. apparent time or 7 h. 20 m. 38 s. mean time; but that, while 251° 6′ was rising with the sun in *longitude*, 257° 26′ would be rising at the same time in *latitude*, or on the northern boundary of the zodiac. The epoch of the Ægon of Mazzaroth, the first degree of the astrological Capricorn, at the same point of time (254°) was critically 3° 26′ west of 257° 26′: and in

this part of the ecliptic and for this latitude one degree on the northern boundary of the zodiac would take 4 m. 25 sec. to rise: so that if 257° 26′ was rising with the sun at 7 h. 26 m. 35 sec. apparent time, 254° must have been rising 15 minutes and 9 seconds earlier *.

Now if Augustus was actually born when 254° was rising in latitude on the morning of December 5 at Rome this year; the article of his birth must have been 7 h. 11 m. 26 sec. apparent time, 15 minutes nine seconds before the actual appearance of the sun. It makes no difference if we take the effect of refraction into account. That could make the sun visible on the horizon only three minutes earlier at the utmost. The critical part of the coincidence is that at this identical moment, Dec. 5 h. at 7.11 m. 26 s. from midnight, apparent time, the first of Ægon in the astrological sphere, the first degree of Capricorn, was actually beginning to be in the ascendant; and actually continued to be so, for four minutes 25 seconds longer, before the second degree, similarly reckoned, began to rise. If Augustus was actually born in the course of these four or five minutes, nothing could be more exact and true than that he was born a little before sunrise, yet when the first of Capricorn in the astrological sphere was in the ascendant; and that consequently according to the astrology of the time he had a Regia Genitura: both which facts, as we have seen, have been uniformly asserted and handed down as characteristic of his nativity. And thus, the objection above stated, formidable as it appeared, has we trust been satisfactorily answered; and instead of militating against our conclusions turns out to be one of the most critical and striking confirmations of them which could have been adduced.

* These data have been supplied through the kindness of Mr. Adams, from strict mathematical calculation. According to our own calculations, and from our own Tables, the obliquity was 23° 42′ 6″, the sun's longitude was 251° 7′ 37″, the declination 22° 20′ 9″ S., and sunrise 7 h. 26 m. 32 s. apparent time, 7 h. 20 m. 29 sec. mean time: each exclusive of refraction.

vi. *On the date of the death of Augustus; and on the length of his life.*

Augustus then having been born at this time, September 23 Roman U. C. 691, Dec. 5 B. C. 63; we have nothing still to consider but the date of his death, and his age at the time, or length of his life.

Obiit, says Suetonius[f], in cubiculo eodem quo pater Octavius duobus Sextis Pompeio et Appuleio consulibus, decimo quarto Kalendas Septembris (Aug. 19 Roman) hora diei nona, septuagesimo et sexto ætatis anno, diebus quinque et triginta minus: i. e. 35 days before the completion of his 76th year, which would have been on September 23 Roman, next ensuing, U. C. 767. Τῇ ἐννεακαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ Αὐγούστου, says Dio[g], ἐν ᾗ ποτε τὸ πρῶτον ὑπάτευσε ... ζήσας μὲν πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη καὶ μῆνας δέκα καὶ ἡμέρας ἓξ καὶ εἴκοσιν· τῇ γὰρ τρίτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου ἐγεγέννητο: in which computation this historian, according to his rule in other instances, reckons August 19, the actual day of Augustus' death, *exclusive* of the length of his life; supposing the eleventh month of his last year to have begun July 23 Roman, and the 26 days therein for which he still survived to have ended on August 18 Roman.

These calculations however involve a double error. First, his actual birthday was not September 23 Julian but December 5. Secondly, the actual date of his death was not August 19 Julian but August 17 Julian, which at that time agreed to August 19 Roman. The precise length of his life then from Dec. 5 B. C. 63 to August 17 A. D. 14 was 75 years, eight months, twelve days, and no more. From the accounts of his death, which are very circumstantial, it appears that he retained his faculties to the last: and we have a still remaining proof of that fact in the extant fragments of the Marmor Ancyranum,[h] as it is called, which contained, when entire, a summary of the principal events of his life, yet was written by him in the very last year of his life, (Scripsi hæc cum annum

[f] Vita, c.

[g] lvi. 30: cf. liv. 19. Velleius Pat. ii. 123: 61: 65 Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 6. Monumentum Ancyranum, Livy (Ruperti) iv. 802. 782. Zonaras, x. 38. 543 C. Florus, iv. 4, 1. Eutropius, vii. 5. Panegyrici Vett. vi. xi. 2.

[h] Livy, Ruperti iv. 802. Cf. Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, iii. No. 4040, col. vii l. 15. p. 90.

agerem septuagensimum et sextum,) and in the consular year of the two Sexti also[i]; consequently after the Kalends of January but before the xiv Kal. Septembres U. C. 767, A. D. 14.

It is a singular oversight into which Suetonius, to judge from the anecdote which he relates in his Life of Augustus concerning Q. Catulus[k], appears to have fallen; in supposing that Augustus was already born before the dedication of the Capitol by Catulus: the date of which was U. C. 685, the consular year of Q. Hortensius and Q. Cæcilius Metellus[l], B. C. 69: six years before the actual date of his birth. In reality however, as it may be collected from Dio[m], Suetonius must have intended something which happened when Cæsar Octavianus, as he was then called, was assuming the Toga Virilis: though not in the lifetime of Catulus, who died B. C. 60, three years after he was born. From Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus[n] it might be inferred that he assumed this Toga at 14 years of age; but, from a comparison of other testimonies to the same fact, we collect that it was assumed in the year after Pharsalia, B. C. 47: and, as we learn from the Antiatine calendar in particular[o], October 18 Roman that year. Consequently not in his 14th or even his 15th year; but just after the completion of his 16th, by the Roman reckoning, from September 23 Roman U. C. 691 to September 23 Roman U. C. 707.

There is also a statement in Servius[p], taken from Donatus, that on the day of his birth a laurel sprang up in *Palatio*; which afterwards supplied the wreaths for the crowns made use of in the celebration of triumphs. He was commenting on Virgil's expression of Ramo felicis olivæ[p]. Sane, ut dicit Donatus, hoc propter Augustum mutavit. nam nata erat laurus in Palatio eo die quo natus est Augustus; unde triumphantes coronari consuerunt. A similar fact was related by Donatus of the springing up of a poplar sapling, planted

i Livy, iv. 736. Cf. Dio, lvi. 33. Suetonius, Aug. cii. 7. Tacitus, Ann. i. 11.

k xciv. 13–15.

l Livy, xcviii. Dio, xxxvii. 44: xliii. 14. Photius, Cod. 97. p. 84. 20, 26: Olymp. clxxvii. 4. Tacitus, Histor. iii. 72. Cicero, In Verr. ii. Lib. iv. 31. 69. Lactantius, i. 6. Cassiodorius, in anno.

m xlv. 2.

n Cap. iv.

o Apud Foggini. See Vol. ii. 124. vi. i.

p Ad Æneid. vi. 230.

at Mantua on the day of the birth of Virgil, the Ides of October U. C. 684 December 7 B. C. 70 [q]. One of these things is just as possible and just as probable as the other. Something of the same kind has been related also of a laurel planted at the time of the birth of Drusus, brother of Tiberius, and the younger son of Livia; born after her marriage to Augustus [r], U. C. 716 B. C. 38. And *this* laurel is said to have supplied the crowns for the *Imperial* triumphs, or those in the Imperial family; the other for those of any other description. Ovid appears to have had both these laurels in view in the apostrophe to his Daphne,

> Tu ducibus nostris aderis cum læta triumphum
> Vox canet, et longas ducent Capitolia pompas.
> Postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos
> Ante fores stabis, mediamque tuebere quercum [s].

SECTION III.—i. *On the Chronology of the conspiracy of Catiline; and on the date of the Orations* In Catilinam.

After the coincidence which has just been pointed out, nothing more it appears to us can be necessary to authenticate and confirm the details of our calendar for this present year; yet it would scarcely be proper to take our leave of it without saying something of the chronology of another memorable event which belongs to it, the conspiracy of Catiline: and on that of the orations of Cicero In Catilinam delivered on the same occasion.

In the passage produced from Suetonius [t], relating to the morning of the birth of Augustus, it was stated that a question was before the senate at that time De conjuratione Catilinæ: from which it would seem to follow that this conspiracy had already been formed and had already come to light on or before the day of the birth of Augustus, September 23 Roman, that year. Even to admit this, we are not aware that it would make any difference to the actual date of his birth; or would throw the least discredit on the truth of the testimonies from which we have collected it, or on the reality of those coincidences by which we have confirmed it. But the

[q] Supra, 317.
[r] Dio, xlviii. 52: 44: 43. Suetonius, Galba, i. 2. 3. Pliny, H. N. xv. 40. 268, 269: cf. 39. 259. 261.
[s] Metamorphos. i. 560.
[t] Supra, 343.

chronology of the conspiracy itself, such as it has come to our knowledge, and such as we are familiar with it, from the history of Sallust and from the orations of Cicero, would be involved in very great difficulties by the truth of the fact which appears to be implied in the statement of Suetonius in question. There is good reason consequently why we should hesitate to receive it, exactly as it is stated. And if we compare the parallel account of Dio relating to the same morning, and to the same meeting of the senate, it does not appear from that on what occasion, or what business, the senate was then meeting. It would not appear that they were meeting on any but an ordinary occasion; much less on so important an occasion as that of the conspiracy of Catiline. Moreover, if Augustus was really born on the 5th of the Julian December, it should be observed that in the Roman calendar, after the Julian correction, this true Julian date of his birth would become and would be called the *Nones* of December. It is well known that in the year of the birth of Augustus, U. C. 691 B. C. 63, which was also the year of the conspiracy of Catiline, there was a meeting of the senate on the *Nones* of December, and a meeting produced by the conspiracy; the most memorable meeting to which the conspiracy had given occasion: the meeting at which the conspirators, having just been detected and just been apprehended, were condemned to death. It is far from impossible that this meeting of the senate on the 5th of December in the year of the birth of Augustus might come in the course of time to be confounded with the day of his birth the same year, the 5th of December also. For though it was known that the nominal date of the birth of Augustus was the 23d of September, it must also have been known that its real date was some day in December; and it must even have been known that it was actually the 5th of December. How, otherwise, could it have been known that he was born when the first degree of Capricorn was in the ascendant? or on what day in the year of his birth could that have been in the ascendant, except the 5th of December? Or how, otherwise, could Theagenes have undertaken to revise and recast his nativity, B. C. 44, as he is said to have done; if it was not known that he was really born on the fifth of De-

cember, and that in the year of his birth September 23 itself coincided with the 5th of December?

But after all, with respect to this particular statement of the business which was engaging the attention of the senate on the morning of the birth of Augustus, it is exceedingly probable that it might have had something to do with the proceedings of Catiline, and yet not with his conspiracy properly so called. It is agreed that this conspiracy did not begin until after the consular comitia, U.C. 691 B.C. 63; and that the principal motive to it on the part of Catiline himself was the irritation produced by the disappointment of his hopes of the consulship, a second time, at those comitia[u]. And though the actual time of these comitia is not known, it may be inferred from various allusions in Cicero[w], and from the concurrent representations of the rise and progress of the conspiracy given by all our authorities, that it must have been some time in the month of October, Roman; between the date at least of the birth of Augustus, viii Kal. Octobres, and the first date which occurs in terms in connection with the conspiracy, xii Kalendas Novembres[x].

Now the desperation and recklessness of Catiline were well known; and from as far back as the comitia U. C. 689 B. C. 65[y]. The life of Cicero and the public peace had been often in danger from that cause alone long before the comitia U. C. 691 B. C. 63[z]. The comitia had been once at least if not oftener deferred on that very account; and on the morning of the election itself it was necessary for Cicero, in self-defence, to descend to the Campus wearing a coat of mail under his Toga[z]. The seditious movements of Catiline therefore might often have engaged the attention of the senate during the Petitio Consulatus, and long before the point of time at which Sallust begins his history of the conspiracy; viz. after the comitia of the year, and with the mission of Manlius by Catiline into Etruria[a].

[u] Sallust, Bell. Cat. 17-25: 26: 27. Dio, xxxvii. 29: 30. Appian, B. C. ii. 2. Plutarch, Cicero, x. xi. Livy, cii.

[w] Cf. also Dio, xxxvii. 29: 30.

[x] In Catilinam, i. 3, 7: cf. xxiii. Pro Murena, 25, 51. 52.

[y] Cf. ad Ann. supra, 329.

[z] xxiii. Pro Murena, 24–26: cf. 1: xix. In Catilin. i. 5, 11: xxv. Pro P. Sulla, 5. Plutarch, Cicero, xiv. xv. Dio, xxxvii. 29. 30.

[a] Cap. xxviii: cf. xxv. xxx. xxxi. xxxii. Dio, xxxvii. 30. 31. Appian, B. C. ii. 2. 3. Cicero. xix. In Catilin. i. 3, 7. 5, 10. ii. 3, 6. 6, 14. 9, 20. xxiii. Pro Murena, 17, 36.

We have already observed that the first date in this history which occurs in terms is xii Kalendas Novembres, October 21 Roman, U. C. 691 Jan. 1 B. C. 62[b]: Meministine me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembres dicere in senatu certo die fore in armis (qui dies futurus esset ante diem vi Kalendas Novembris) Cn. Manlium audaciæ satellitem atque administrum tuæ? And this too must have been the day when the senate passed the decree so often alluded to by Cicero[c]: Habemus senatus consultum in te Catilina vehemens et grave — Habemus enim hujusmodi senatus consultum ..... quo ex senatus consulto confestim interfectum te esse Catilina convenit: a decree which Sallust[e] seems to have thought was passed on the same day in the morning of which two of the conspirators, C. Cornelius and L. Varguntеius, were to have executed the design against the life of Cicero, which had been concerted the evening before[f]. But *this* morning was that of the day before that on which Cicero delivered the first of his extant orations In Catilinam, in the senate; as appears from various allusions in it and in the rest of the same orations[g]: and that oration was followed by the flight of Catiline either the same evening or early the next morning[h]; and he himself dates this oration on the *twentieth* day since the passing of the decree in question: At nos *vicesimum* jam diem patimur hebescere aciem horum auctoritatis. habemus enim hujusmodi senatus consultum, verum inclusum in tabulis, tanquam gladium in vagina reconditum[i].

The actual date of this oration indeed has always been considered a doubtful point. There are however only two days between which opinions appear to have varied[k]; the viii Idus and the vi Idus Novembres. In Asconius' opinion the true date was this last; for he reckons the entire interval from the passing of the decree to the delivery of this speech, (which Cicero makes to be *twenty* days,) only at *eighteen* days: Idem (sc. Cicero), in ea quoque quam habuit in Catilinam in senatu, cum octavus decimus dies esset postquam factum S. C. ut viderent consules ne quid Respublica detrimenti caperet, dixit

[b] xix. In Catilin. i. 3, 7.
[c] Ibid. i. 3: 2, 4.
[e] Cap. xxviii. xxix. xxx.
[f] Cap. xxix. Cf. Dio, xxxvii. 32, 33.
[g] i. 4, 8: 9: 10. Cf. ii. 6, 12: 13. xxv. Pro P. Sulla, 6, 18: 18, 52.
[h] ii. 3, 6: 4, 6. Dio, xxxvii. 33.
[i] i. 2, 4.
[k] Cf. the Argumentum.

Vigesimum jam diem, &c.[l]. Now 18 is the exact interval from xii Kal. Nov. (October 21 Roman) to vi Idus Nov. (Nov. 8 Roman). In assuming then that *this* was the actual date of the speech which drove away Catiline we should have the authority of Asconius. Cicero's own calculation of the interval from the passing of the decree to this day is to be explained by his peculiar mode of reckoning in such cases[m]: according to which, as the date of the decree was xii Kal. Novembres and that of the speech vi Idus Novembres, he reckoned *twelve* days to October, and *eight* to November; *twenty* in all from the decree to the speech.

In the speech pro P. Sulla[n] the night of the meeting at the house of Lecca (M. Porcius Læca, as Sallust styles him[o]), when the scheme was concocted for the assassination of Cicero at his own home the next morning, is described as Nox ea quæ consecuta est posterum diem Nonarum Novembrium; and as the most critical and dangerous period of the conspiracy. The day after the Nones could be only the viii Idus. This plot therefore was formed on the night of viii Idus, Nov. 6 Roman, Jan. 17 Julian B. C. 62. The attempt to execute it was made the next morning, vii Idus, Nov. 7 Roman, Jan. 18 Julian. The first oration In Catilinam, followed by his departure from the city the same night or the next morning, was delivered the day after, vi Idus; Nov. 8 Roman January 19 Julian[p]. Sallust has consequently made a mistake in dating the senatusconsult, Viderent consules, &c. on *this* day: unless it was renewed on this day. It must have been passed 20 days before, as Cicero supposes, 18 as Asconius; and it might be inferred even from Sallust himself that it had been already passed before the arrival of the news of the rising of Manlius at Fæsulæ[q], vi Kalendas Novembres.

There were two meetings of the conspirators, before the delivery of this first oration; each by night: one on the night of the viii Idus, which Cicero calls the Nox superior, or Nox prior; the other on that of the vii Idus, which he terms

[l] P. 122. in Oration. in Pison.
[m] Cf. Vol. i. 517.
[n] xxv. 18, 52.
[o] Cap. xxviii: xvii. Cf. Cicero, in Catilin. i. 4, 9: 10.
[p] Cf. Sallust, Bell. Cat. xxxii: xxxiii.
[q] Ibid. xxix. xxxi.

the Nox proxima[r]: and on the morning after this latter he delivered the oration in the senate, which expelled Catiline[s].

If there is any thing to object to this conclusion, it seems to be from the second oration[t], which was certainly delivered to the people of Rome on the day of the escape of Catiline[u]; and in this both the convocation of the senate after the attempt on the life of Cicero and the attempt itself apparently are dated on the same day, the day before the speech: *Hesterno die* cum domi meæ pæne interfectus essem senatum in ædem Jovis Statoris vocavi[w]. It is sufficient however to explain this language that the senate was called together the *day before* and *in consequence of* that attempt. It is not of necessity implied by it that the attempt was made the day before; and other allusions to it shew that it was in reality made the day but one before[x].

The earliest date then, in reference to this conspiracy of Catiline's, which occurs in terms, is xii Kalendas Novembres[y], October 21 Roman U. C. 691, Jan. 1 B. C. 62. Manlius had already been sent into Etruria before that day; and the time concerted for his rising in arms there was vi Kalendas Novembres, six days later, October 27 Roman, January 7 Julian.

On the v Kalendas Novembres, the day after this, October 28 Roman, January 8 Julian, (a Nundinal day, as our calendar shews, and very probably for that reason selected,) Catiline had projected a general massacre of the *Optimates* at Rome[y].

On the Kalends of November, Jan. 12 B. C. 62, Præneste was to have been occupied[z]: after which, we meet with no more dates in terms, except one, (which comes in on the day of the delivery of the first oration, the vi Idus Novembres,) an allusion to the Idus Proximæ[a], when Catiline is reminded that his debts would become due, and he would find himself a total bankrupt. This must mean the Ides of November next in course, January 24.

The dates of all the orations In Catilinam, after the first, are easily to be determined.

[r] In Catilin. i. 1: 4, 8: ii. 6, 13.
[s] Cf. Ad Atticum, ii. 1.
[t] ii. 6, 12.
[u] ii. 1, 1: 3, 6: 4, 6. Cf. Ad Atticum, ii. 1.
[w] ii. 6, 12: 13.
[x] Cf. ii. 3, 6.
[y] i. 3, 7.
[z] i. 3, 8.
[a] i. 6, 14. Cf. Vol. ii. p. 544.

The day of the execution of the conspirators, at last, it is well known, was the Nones of December[b] U. C. 691 Feb. 14 B. C. 62. The fourth oration was delivered on that day, on occasion of the debate previously held respecting their treatment[c].

The third oration was delivered two days before, iii Nonas Decembres, Dec. 3 Roman February 12 Julian; on the day when the conspirators (who had been arrested the same morning) were first examined before the senate[d]: but towards night, or the end of the day[e]. Vulturcius, the bearer of the letters of Catiline's accomplices at Rome which they were sending to him, had been arrested *that* morning on the Pons Mulvius; and Cicero has defined the precise time of his arrest, Tertia fere vigilia exacta[f]: the parties then apprehended being brought before him in person, Cum jam lucesceret[g]. These allusions imply that there was no moon at the time. Nor could there be any February 12 B. C. 62; for the moon was new February 8.

The second oration was delivered to the people in public the day after the escape of Catiline[h]: v Idus Novembres, Nov. 9 Roman, January 20 Julian: from which it may be inferred that the actual time of his departure was not the morning of January 20 but the evening of January 19; as indeed it appears from Sallust was the case: for he tells us he left Rome Nocte intempesta. There would be moonlight on that evening: for the moon was then only three or four days distant from the full *.

* The day fixed upon by the conspirators for the rising in the city, and the rest of the proceedings consequent upon it which they were medi-

[b] Cf. Ad Atticum, i. 19: ii. 1: x. 1; xii. 21: xvi. 14: Ad Fam. i. 9: Ad Brutum, 17: Oratio iv. in Catilin. 7: 8: 9, 18: 19: Oratio xxiv. Pro L. Flacco, 40, 102: xxviii. Post Reditum, 5, 12: xxxi. Pro Plancio, 37, 90: xxxvii. In Pison. 2, 5. Plutarch, Cicero, xx—xxii: Cato Min. xxiii. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xiv. Sallust, Bell. Cat. l—lviii. Dio, xxxvii. 30: 36. Appian, B. C. ii. 4—6. Vell. Pat. ii. 34: 35.

[c] Oratio iv in Catilin. 4, 7: 5, 9: xxv. Pro P. Sulla, 11, 33: Ad Attic. ii. 1. Sallust, Bell. Cat. xlix—lviii. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xiv.

[d] Oratio iii. 1, 1: 2, 5: 3, 8: 6, 14: 9, 21: iv. 3, 5: 5, 10: 6, 13. Dio, xxxvii. 35. Appian, B. C. ii. 4—6.

[e] iii. 12, 29. [f] Ibid. 2, 6.

[g] Ibid. 3, 6: 2, 6. Cf. Sallust, xlix—lviii.

[h] ii. 1, 1: 3, 6: 4, 6: 6, 12: Ad Atticum, ii. 1. Appian, B. C. ii. 3. Bell. Cat. xxxiii.

The dates of these different orations then stand as follows.

Dates of the Orations in Catilinam U. C. 691 B. C. 62.

Oratio Prima,	vi Idus Novembres,	January	19	B. C. 62
.. Secunda,	v	..	20	.. ..
.. Tertia,	iii Nonas Decembres,	February	12	.. ..
.. Quarta,	Nonis Decembribus,	..	14	.. ..

ii. *On the time of the final defeat of Catiline.*

It remains then to consider briefly the conclusion of these proceedings.

The final defeat of Catiline is dated by Dio in the consular year of the successors of Cicero and Antonius, U. C. 692, D. Junius Silanus L. Licinius Murena: Ἐν ἀρχῇ εὐθὺς τοῦ ἔτους ἐν ᾗ Ἰούνιός τε Σιλανὸς καὶ Λούκιος Λικίννιος ἤρξαν[i]. And it appears also from Livy[k] that Antonius, Cicero's colleague, was commanding *pro consule* at the time: i. e. it was strictly later than the expiration of his proper consular year.

Now that this was likely to be the case might be collected from the testimony of Cicero himself, in his Oration Pro L. Murena. That oration was delivered before the end of his year, but only just before it; between the tribunician ingress Dec. 10 U. C. 691 and the consular the Kalends of January U. C. 692[l]: and it is clear from it that the conspiracy had not yet been finally suppressed[m]; and that Cicero expected the contest to be protracted into the next consular year[n]. And this was no doubt the principal reason of the anxiety which he expresses more than once in the course of the

tating, was the Saturnalia, Dec. 17 Roman, Feb. 26: In Catilin. iii. 4, 10: 7, 17. Plutarch, Cicero, xviii.

The rewards decreed to the informer Vulturcius, and to the Allobroges, must have been so on the day between that of the arrest of the conspirators, Dec. 3 Roman, and that of their execution, Dec. 5; consequently Dec. 4 Roman, Feb. 13. Cf. iv. 3, 5: 5, 10: iii. 6, 14. 15.

[i] xxxvii. 39—42: cf. Appian, B. C. ii. 7.

[k] ciii.

[l] xxiii. Pro Murena, 2, 4: 37, 81: 38, 82: cf. xxiv. Pro Flacco, 39, 98. Plutarch, Cato Min. xxi.

[m] Ibid. 39, 84: cf. xxxii. Pro Sextio, 5, 12.

[n] Ibid. 39, 85: cf. 37, 78. 79.

speech that the republic should not be found without consuls on the first of January about to ensue[o].

There would consequently be every reason to suppose that the ultimate termination of this war of Catiline must have come in the next consular year; and apparently some time later than its commencement. And yet it appears from Sallust[p] that Catiline came to the determination of giving battle, and setting the issue on the result of a single decisive action, only in consequence of the failure of his plans at Rome; and especially of the death of his accomplices there: and as that happened on the Nones of December, it could not fail to be known of in Etruria before the end of the year. On this principle it might be expected that the decision of the contest would not be much later than the beginning of the next consular year.

This year began March 11 B. C. 62; and that might be reckoned for the climate of Italy to be rather in the spring than still in the winter of the natural year. And in the speech which Sallust puts into the mouth of Catiline[q], to encourage his followers, just before the battle, (the scene of which, according to Sallust[r], was the Ager Pistoriensis,) there is no allusion to any hardships under which they were labouring at the time from the weather, nor to any impediments in the way of the march across the Apennines which they were attempting[s], except from the want of provisions and the difficulty of subsistence.

Under these circumstances, the testimony of Cicero in his Oration Pro P. Sextio is calculated at first sight to occasion some perplexity. This P. Sextius was Antonius' quæstor[t] in the year of his consulship. He was at Rome with an armed force, for the maintenance of the public peace, between the beginning of the tribunician and the end of the consular year, U. C. 691[u]; Dec. 10 Roman and Dec. 29: and yet immediately after, and before the expiration of the year, he was already in the field[w] with Antonius to oppose Catiline. Hic ego, Cicero next observes, quid prædicem quibus hic rebus consulem (not proconsulem) ad rem gerendam excitarit? . . .

[o] Ibid. 2, 4: 37, 79.
[p] lix—lxii.
[q] lxi.
[r] lix.: cf. Obsequens, cxxiii.
[s] lix.
[t] xxxii. 3, 8.
[u] xxxii. 5, 11.
[w] Ibid. 5, 12.

longum est ea dicere; sed hoc breve dicam: si M. Petreii non excellens animo... virtus, non summa auctoritas apud milites... exstitisset; neque adjutor ei P. Sextius ad excitandum Antonium cohortandum impellendum fuisset; *datus illo in bello esset hiemi locus:* neque umquam Catilina, cum e pruina Apennini atque e nivibus illis emersisset, atque æstatem integram nactus Italiæ calles et pastorum præclara stabula cepisset, sine multo sanguine ac sine totius Italiæ vastitate miserrima concidisset.

That the command of the consular army in the final engagement did rest with Petreius appears from Sallust[x]. The consul Antonius was disabled by the gout in his feet at the time. Now it might be supposed from the *prima facie* meaning of these words, *Datus illo in bello esset hiemi locus,* that the contest after all must have been decided *before* the winter. And that would be directly at variance with the fact that even the departure of Catiline from Rome, as we learn from the second oration[y], was not earlier than the middle of winter: Verumtamen quid sibi isti miseri volunt? num suas secum mulierculas sunt in castra ducturi? quemadmodum autem illis carere poterunt his præsertim jam noctibus? quo autem pacto illi Apenninum atque illas pruinas ac nives perferent? nisi idcirco se facilius hiemem toleraturos putant quod nudi in conviviis saltare didicerunt. The date of this oration was Nov. 9 Roman, Jan. 20 B. C. 62: and at that time Cicero might well insist both on the length of the nights and on the severity of the season.

If then it was already the middle of winter only the day after Catiline's departure from Rome, it must have been much nearer to the beginning of spring than to the middle of winter when he was finally defeated. If at least he was defeated by Antonius *pro consule;* it could not have been less than the interval from v Idus Nov. U. C. 691 to the Kalends of January U. C. 692, (that is than 50 days,) after the middle of winter. It could not therefore have been the meaning of Cicero, in the passage above cited, that but for Petreius and Sextius the war would have been protracted into the winter. The true sense of the passage has been

[x] lxii. Cf. Dio, xxxvii. 39. [y] xx. In Catilin. ii. 10, 23: cf. 5, 10.

mistaken. By the words, *Datus illo in bello esset hiemi locus*, we are not to understand that winter would have come on before the contest had been decided, but that the decision of the contest itself would have been deferred until after the winter. It was the middle of winter when the consular army took the field; and it was owing to the spirit and perseverance of Petreius and Sextius that notwithstanding it kept the field even at that season of the year, until the contest was decided. Under ordinary circumstances the consul or proconsul Antonius might have waited until the winter was over; and might have been excused for doing so. The energy and resolution of his legates, Petreius and Sextius, prevented that; and therefore for the speedy and unexpected decision of the contest the republic was indebted to them. This is the true sense of the words in question. None else it is evident could be consistent either with the whole course of proceedings before and after, or with Cicero's own testimony in other instances. Instead therefore of implying that Catiline was defeated at last before winter, they imply just the reverse; that he was defeated critically *in* the winter or just *after* the winter; that is, in the early spring *.

Section IV.—*On the administration of the Calendar U. C.* 689—691 *B. C.* 65—63.

We shall conclude the consideration of this year U. C. 691 B. C. 63 with one more observation.

* There is a double allusion in Cicero (In Catilin. i. 9, 24: ii. 6, 13) to some *Aquila argentea* which Catiline sent away from Rome before his departure. It appears from Sallust (cap. lxii.) that in the last battle he had with him an eagle, which had formerly belonged to Marius; and to which, it would seem, he attached a superstitious influence. This is no doubt the eagle meant by Cicero: cf. Pliny, H. N. x. 5. 18.

This phrase, *dare locum*, in the sense of *giving room*, allowing scope or opportunity, for a particular thing or purpose, is no doubt perfectly classical. We will observe only that, in the New Testament, Romans xii. 19, in Greek is a parallel construction: Μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες ἀγαπητοί· ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. γέγραπται γάρ· Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις· Ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος. Δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ here means Give room, allow room, (scope and opportunity,) for the wrath *of God*. No other sense can be consistent with the context.

The necessity of the case requires that one of the first two years of this seventh period, U. C. 690 or U. C. 691 B. C. 64 or B. C. 63, should be intercalary; and it is indifferent to the arrangements of our own calendar, before and after these points of time respectively, which it may be assumed to have been. But the rule hitherto observed, as far as we have been able to discover, being to have a common year and an intercalary year alternately, and B. C. 65 U. C. 689 the last year of Period vi having been intercalary; since there is no reason of which we are aware why this rule should have been interrupted just at this point of time, we have assumed that the common year next in course would be U. C. 690 B. C. 64, and the intercalary one U. C. 691 B. C. 63.

The opposition of Jupiter at the beginning of Cicero's consular year, April 17 B.C. 63[z], would still be truly described as having happened early in that year, though the Kalends of January the same year fell actually on February 26; and if the year before had been intercalated they would have fallen on March 21. On this point the reader is at liberty to judge for himself. It is indifferent to the details of our calendar which of these years, B. C. 64 and 63, is common, and which is intercalary; provided both are not common or both intercalary.

The care of the calendar at this time still belonged to Q. Cæcilius Metellus. He was certainly living all through U. C. 690 B. C. 64; and for some time also U. C. 691 B. C. 63. But he died *in* this year; and the only question is at what period of the year? According to Dio[a] it was at the end of it; and so critically at the end that he must have died some time between the Nones of December, the day on which the accomplices of Catiline were executed, and December 10, the Tribunician ingress, when Labienus must have gone out of office: the tribune who during his term of office this year revived the law of Domitius[b] (abrogated by Sulla) which gave or restored the right of electing the Pontifex Maximus to the people; for according to Dio also, by virtue of the right so restored, Julius Cæsar was elected in the room of Metellus in

[z] Supra, p. 17.
[b] Supra, p. 27.
[a] xxxvii. 37: cf. 26. 38. Cf. Plutarch, Cæsar, vii.

the interval in question. Metellus himself therefore must have died in the same interval too.

But this was scarcely possible. In fact, according to Sallust[c], the election to the Pontificate, at which Julius Cæsar carried the day against Catulus* and the rest of his competitors, was over before the Nones of December; and Sallust in that respect is virtually confirmed by Suetonius[d], who appears to date Cæsar's election to that office before his election to the prætorship, which took place at the time of the consular comitia of the year also: that is, as we have already seen reason to conclude, some time in October Roman. Metellus then probably died early in the latter half of B. C. 63. The intercalation of the year, if made at all, must have been made previously, and under his direction; and he was a personal friend of Cicero, and might wish on many accounts to lengthen his term of office. We have in Cicero[e] an account of his death itself; from which we collect that he died on the third day after he began to be ill: and though before the conspiracy of Catiline had yet come to an head, not before it was known of, or suspected; nor before the danger which was to be apprehended from it was already foreseen.

Section V.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 3. 355 *days.*

U. C. 692 Varr. 691 Cap. 689 Polyb. B. C. 62.

D. Junius Silanus
L. Licinius Murena.

Kalendæ Januariæ March 11 B. C. 62. Nundinal Char. 3.

In any year of the Roman calendar, (the regular or the irregular alike,) the distance in days, between September 23 and January 1, would be 96; one description of years only being

* The enmity of Catulus to Cæsar, alluded to in these accounts, B. C. 63, could not have been the effect of Cæsar's accusation of him, De Capitolio: because, according to Suetonius, (Vita, xv.) that accusation was instituted Primo Prætoræ die, Jan. 1. B. C. 62.

[c] Bell. Cat. xlix.
[d] Julius Cæsar, xiii. xiv. Cf. Plutarch, Cæsar, vii. Cicero, Ad Attic. xii. 21.
[e] Oratio, xxxiv. Pro M. Cœlio, 24, 54.

excepted, viz. those which consisted of 356 days: in which it would be 97 days. The 23rd of September Roman then U. C. 691 being given, and there being no reason to suppose that the year itself had 356 days; the Kalends of January U. C. 692 will also be given. If the former was Dec. 5 B. C. 63 the latter would be March 11 B. C. 62. This reasoning (the premises on which it is founded being granted), it must be admitted, is conclusive.

Again the Kalends of January in any year being given the Kalends of February also will be given; but not the Kalends of any month later than February: unless it is known whether the year was to be common or intercalary; and if intercalary, whether the Merkedonius was to be 23 days long or 22. But that also being known, if the Kalends of January are given then those of every month from the beginning to the end of the year will be given also.

Now to apply these positions to the present year, U. C. 692, of which the Kalends of January are known, because the 23rd of September Roman the year before is known; but of which it is not yet known whether it was common or intercalary: i. U. C. 691 having been intercalary it would be most probable that U. C. 692 would be common. ii. U. C. 692 must have been actually common. The administration of the irregular calendar from this time forward down to the Julian correction, and the Roman characters of subsequent years in particular instances, render it demonstratively certain that there could have been only one intercalary year more between U. C. 691 and U. C. 708, the year of the correction itself: and that year, it is known from testimony, was U. C. 702 B. C. 52. Lastly, it is in our power to establish this fact, (viz. that the year was common,) of the present year by a distinct and independent argument; which turns indeed on a nice and critical point, but is not the less conclusive on that account.

i. *On the rule of the alternation of the Fasces between the Consuls of the Romans.*

The alternation of the Fasces (i. e. of the insignia of power and jurisdiction, the authority of life and death,) between the consuls of the Romans, as the ordinary and yet the supreme

certainly the popular candidate, and probably the first elected; still the privilege of having the Fasces first would belong to Æmilius Paullus.

Now we have it on testimony, (uniform and invariable testimony,) that the day before the battle of Cannæ the Fasces were *Penes* Paullum, and on the day of the battle were *Penes* Varronem. The day of the battle is known to have been iv Nonas Sextiles[l], Sextilis 2 Roman. We have nothing then to do but to begin the alternation on the day after the ingress at this time, March 16 Roman, and to reckon 68 turns, 136 days, a day to each of the consuls in his turn, beginning with Paullus, and we shall find that the 69th turn of the latter would actually be Sextilis 1, and Varro's Sextilis 2.

The second case is that of U. C. 586 B. C. 168, the consular year of L. Æmilius Paullus ii C. Licinius Crassus[m]. The same criterions as before are applicable also to this. Æmilius Paullus was no doubt older than his colleague, and nobler than his colleague; and was certainly now entering on his second consulship, Licinius only on his first: and besides he had been the first returned. For these reasons he would be entitled to have the Fasces first. If then it was his first turn March 16 and Licinius' March 17; it would be his seventh turn March 28, Licinius' March 29; his eighth turn March 30, Licinius' March 31: as, from the contemporary testimony of the Acta diurna[n], it is seen actually to have been.

To apply these conclusions then to the present year, U. C. 692 B. C. 62; There is a fragment of the Acta diurna for this year also still in existence[n] in which two dates occur: iii Idus Sextiles, Fasces penes Murenam, and v Kalendas Septembres, Fasces penes Syllanum. The former means Sextilis 11, the latter Sextilis 26. There were just fifteen days between them; consequently if Murena had the Fasces on the 11th, he would have them again on the 25th, and Silanus on the 26th: and so far these entries are entirely consistent one with the other.

We do not indeed know which of these consuls was the senior; yet from Cicero's oration Pro Murena it may be

[l] A Gellius, v. 17. Macrobius, Saturnalia, i. 16. 281.

[m] Supra, p. 154.

[n] Dodwell, Dissertationes Camdenianæ, Appendix, 690.

collected that he was probably young in comparison of his colleague: and perhaps of not more than the legal consular age 42 or 43. In all copies of the Fasti Silanus' name takes precedence of his; and that is some argument that he was his senior. This question however is not of much importance to the illustration of the calendar for the year by the rule of the alternation of the Fasces. If it be only true that it was Murena's turn to have them on Sextilis 11, and it may only be assumed that the alternation itself began on January 2 Roman; it will follow that the year must have been common, and that Silanus (for whatsoever reason) must have had the Fasces *de facto* on January 2, and Murena January 3; and so on.

Between January 2 and Sextilis 12 the interval in a common year amounted to 218 days; so that if Silanus' first turn was January 2 his 110th would be Sextilis 12: if Murena's first turn was January 3 his 109th would be Sextilis 11. In an intercalary year of 378 days, the distance from January 2 to Sextilis 11 would be 240 days; so that if Silanus' first turn in such a year was January 2 his 121st would be Sextilis 11: on which day this year Murena had the Fasces. This year consequently could not have been intercalated; at least with a Merkedonius of 23 days. It is true that, with a Merkedonius of 23 days, if Murena's first turn had been January 2, his 121st might have been Sextilis 11. But that would imply that he must have been the senior consul, and have taken precedence of his colleague; of which there is no proof, but rather every presumption to the contrary. With a Merkedonius of 22 days also, if Silanus' first turn had been January 2, his 121st would have been Sextilis 12, as it appears to have been. But what right should we have to assume that, if there was a Merkedonius this year, it was one of 22 days and not of 23 days? We have already observed indeed that this year U. C. 692 could not have been intercalary. The Acta therefore according to their first and most natural construction confirm the calendar; and the calendar in its turn illustrates the Acta. The Kalends of January then this year being given, and the length of the year being given; the Kalends of every month from the beginning to the end of the year are also given.*

* As it thus clearly appears from the three examples of the fact above adduced B. C. 216 B. C. 168 and B. C. 62 that the Fasces were held alter-

magistrates of every year, is a subject to which we have had occasion to refer more than once before.

It does not appear to have ever been the rule that both the consuls should have the Fasces at once; and the first institution of a rule of some kind which gave them alternately first to one and then to the other is ascribed even to the first pair of consuls, Brutus and Collatinus. The only question is whether this was a monthly, or a daily, alternation of its kind. In the course of time too, if not from the first, it appears to have become and to have been acted on as a rule that upon the *first* day of the official year, the day of the *ingress*, out of respect to the day itself, (the appearance and character of which was supposed to stamp that of the rest of the year,) and out of respect to the people, (from whom, by keeping out of sight the ensigns of power on that day, it was thus acknowledged that even the supreme magistrate for the time being ultimately derived his authority,) neither the consuls nor any other magistrate acting instead of the consuls should have or should exhibit the Fasces. For this reason it is represented as a very unusual thing, and as tantamount to an open declaration that they intended to govern by force and intimidation, that on the very day when the second body of Decemvirs entered upon office, the Ides of May U. C. 305, they appeared in public with 12 lictors before each of their number, 120 in all[f]: and the same construction was put upon the act of Sulla, when he proceeded Dictator U. C. 673 B. C. 81, with 24 lictors; Quod nemo unquam fecerat[g]—i. e. on the very first day from which the office itself bore date: for that the Dictator, as uniting in his single person the right and jurisdiction of both the consuls, was legally and constitutionally entitled at any other time to 24 lictors[h], there can be no doubt.

This being the case, it may be presumed that the alternation of the Fasces would not begin on the day of the ingress; but at the earliest on the day after it. And with regard to the rule of the alternation itself, perhaps the most correct

[f] Dionysius Hal. x. 59. Livy, iii. 36.
[g] Livy, lxxxix. Appian, B.C. i. 99, 100.
[h] Cf. Plutarch, Fabius Maximus, iv. Polyb. iii. 87. 7.

idea of the principles by which it was regulated may be formed from the testimony of A. Gellius, where he is speaking of the respect and deference originally paid among the Romans to age, and subsequently to marriage; and is illustrating it among other instances by *this* of the alternation of the Fasces[i].

Sic capite septimo legis Juliæ priori ex consulibus fasces sumendi potestas fit non qui pluris annos natus est sed qui pluris liberos quam collega in sua potestate habet aut bello amisit. sed si par utrique numerus liberorum est, maritus aut qui in numero maritorum est (a person betrothed or engaged to be married) præfertur. si vero ambo et mariti et patres totidem liberorum sunt tum ille pristinus honos instauratur; et qui major natu est prior fasces sumit...solitos autem audio qui lege potiores essent fasces primi mensis collegis concedere aut longe ætate prioribus aut nobilioribus multo aut secundum consulatum ineuntibus.

The Lex Julia indeed, De Maritandis ordinibus, was passed by Augustus U. C. 736[k]; but the old rule of the Fasces is plainly recognized in the preceding passage, as first and properly seniority, or superior age: and secondly, (sometimes even to the prejudice of the former,) superior nobility or personal dignity.

Now there are two cases of the alternation in question to which we may appeal in illustration, and at the same time in confirmation, of the rule. The first is that of the consular year of C. Terentius Varro L. Æmilius Paullus ii U. C. 538 B. C. 216, the year of Cannæ. There is little doubt that each of the criterions specified in A. Gellius would apply to *this* case; and so as to adjudge the Fasces first to Paullus: as the senior in age, as more noble than Varro, (belonging as he did to the order of the Patricians, Varro to that of the Plebeians,) and as his superior in titular rank, and personal dignity; as Vir Consularis even before his election for this year, and as entering on his second consulship when Varro was entering on his first. Consequently though Varro was

[i] Noctes Atticæ, ii. 15. Cf. Festus, xi. 216. 7 Majorem Consulem: xvi. 438. 3 Remisso exercitu.

[k] Dio, liv. 16. 12. 18. Livy, lix. Suetonius, Aug. xxxiv. 1. Cf. Horace, Carm. Sæculare, 17–20.

first day available for an address to the people. The first was a dies feriatus, the second a dies religiosus. The third is the first in the Julian calendar marked as comitial.

ii. We learn from the same Acta Diurna, cited supra, that Cicero's speech Pro Publio Cornelio Sulla, which is still extant, was delivered this year on v Kalendas Septembres, Sextilis 26: Tullius causam dixit pro Cornel. Sulla apud judices de conjuratione: and that he was acquitted. In a common year the character of Sextilis was always the same as that of January; and consequently Sextilis 3 was Nundinal this year, and Sextilis 27, but not Sextilis 26: so that this action came on the day before a Nundinal day; though whether the Nundinal incidence was particularly considered in cases like these of the pleading of causes before judges specially appointed, and not before the regular tribunals, is a point on which we have not been able to satisfy ourselves.

iii. There is another entry in these Acta, for the next day, iiii Kalendas Septembres, (Sextilis 27,) Funus Metellæ Piæ Vestæ Virginis illatæ sepulcro suorum majorum Via Aurelia. This day was *Nundinal:* and we have seen reason to conclude that for burial solemnities the Nundinal incidence was as much studied and preferred, when circumstances admitted of it, as for other purposes and on other occasions it was avoided: principally too because of the analogy between the stated duration of such solemnities and of the Novendiales Epulæ and that of the Nundinal cycle[z].

It is some further argument of the Nundinal incidence on *this* day, that, as appears from the last quoted entry in these same Acta, there was a brawl or riot upon it Ad tres Tabernas; in which the tavern keeper was killed by some drunken Thracians (probably gladiators): Caupo ad Tres Tabernas occisus a Thracibus ebriis in via publica. A Nundinal day was a market day. In such a city as Rome, there would be more of this kind of excess on a Nundinal day than even on any other.

We learn also from these Acta ad v Kal. Sept. (Sextilis 26)

[z] See Vol. ii. 6. note: 44. note. There is an instance in Cicero (Ad Quintum Fratrem, iii. 8) of a Laudatio funebris, a. d. iix (viii) Kal. Dec. U.C. 700, Nov. 23 Roman, B.C. 54, the day after a Nundinal day, Nov. 22 Roman. Might we correct the text by reading ix for iix Kal. Dec. it would be the Nundinal day itself Nov. 22.

that Cæsar set out to his province (Spain) Ex Prætura on that day; C. Cæsar in Hispaniam ulteriorem ex Prætura proficiscitur diu prius retardatus a creditoribus: which is a curious reason to be found assigned for the delay in question in such a document as this*. The Julian date of this departure at last would be October 30 B. C. 62; only just in time to reach his destination before the winter. He returned from Spain, U. C. 694 B. C. 60[a], in like manner only just in time for the comitia consularia that year; in order to stand at which he sacrificed his chance of a triumph for his successes in Spain[b]. And, as these appear to have been held about the same time of the year, B. C. 60, at which he had set out from Rome in B. C. 62; it follows that he was probably absent in Spain just two years.

SECTION VI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 4. 355 *days.*

U. C. 693 Varr. 692 Cap. 690 Polyb. B. C. 61.

M. Pupius Piso Calpurnianus
M. Valerius Messalla.

Kalendæ Januariæ Feb. 29 B. C. 61. Nundinal Char. 8.

The Nundinal character of this year has been probably illustrated from the account of the profanation of the ceremonies of the Bona Dea at Rome by Clodius, and of the proceedings which arose out of it[c]. We may observe however that the Kalends of January U. C. 692 being known, and the length of the year being known, the Kalends of January U. C. 693 must also be known. There is consequently no room for doubt concerning the Julian date of these Kalends,

* Appian, B. C. ii. 8 states the amount of his debts at this time at 25,000,000 drachmæ, 807,291*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* Cf. Arbuthnot, p. 116. Suetonius, Julius, xviii. 1. Plutarch, Cæsar, xi. Crassus, vii. It seems Crassus became surety for him at last, so as to enable him to escape from the importunity of his creditors.

[a] Dio, xxxvii. 52.
[b] Ibid. 52–54. Suetonius, xviii. 3. Appian, B. C. ii. 8. Livy, ciii. Plutarch, Cæsar, xiii. Cato Minor, xxxi.
[c] Vol. ii. 47.

ii. *On the Nundinal character of U. C. 692 B. C. 62.*

If however we take into account the Nundinal cycle, which

nately day by day; we are much at a loss to understand the following observation of Suetonius, with reference to the public proceedings of Julius Cæsar, in the year of his consulship U. C. 695 B. C. 59: Antiquum etiam retulit morem ut quo *mense* fasces non haberet accensus ante eum iret lictores pone sequerentur[1].

The 12 Lictors, according to Livy[2], were as old as Romulus and originally derived from the Etrurians and their 12 Lucumones. Under the Republic each consul had 12 lictors[3], the dictator had 24[3], the prætor had 6[4].

The institution of a menstrual rule of alternation is attributed by Dionysius to the two first consuls Brutus and Collatinus: Γίγνεσθαι δὲ τῶν πελέκεων τὴν παράληψιν ἐκ περιτροπῆς, ἕνα μῆνα κατέχοντος αὐτοὺς παραλλὰξ ἑκατέρου[5]. In this statement Livy too agrees with him[6]; yet the consul who had not the axes had 12 lictors with rods[5]. Cicero makes the first author of this rule to have been Valerius Poplicola[7]: Itaque Publicola lege illa de provocatione lata statim secures de fascibus demi jussit[8], postridieque sibi collegam Sp. Lucretium subrogavit, suosque ad eum, quod erat major natu, lictores transire jussit[9]: instituitque primus ut singulis consulibus alternis mensibus lictores præirent.

Dionysius speaks of Ἡ τοῦ μηνὸς ἡγεμονία, U.C. 284 B.C. 470[10], as *penes* one of the consuls only, Titus Quinctius Capitolinus, at that time. We may infer from him too[11] that the same rule of a monthly alternation still held good U. C. 300 B. C. 454, and abroad too as well as at home.

It seems difficult to doubt in opposition to this testimony that the rule at first was to have a monthly alternation. And yet it is equally necessary to the truth of testimony to suppose that this monthly alternation must sometime have been changed for a daily one. The Decemvirs of the first body, according to Livy[12], each had the Fasces one day; each too presiding and administering justice for one day. We may therefore probably infer that the change of rule was introduced by them. The regular alternation of the Fasces in the year of Cannæ is attested by Polybius also[13]; and it was certainly a daily one: and an alternate rule of some kind is still recognized and illustrated U. C. 726 B. C 28, in the consulship of Augustus vi and Agrippa ii[14].

In the passage produced from A. Gellius, supra, the alternation is sup-

1 Vita, xx. 2. cf. Livy, iii. 33.
2 i. 8. cf. Dionysius, ii. 29: iii. 61.
3 Polybius, iii. 87, 7.
4 Appian, Syriaca, 15.
5 v. 2: 75: cf. iv. 74. 6 ii. 1.
7 De Republica, ii.
8 Cf. Dionysius, v. 19. x. 59. Plutarch, Poplicola, x.
9 Cf Valerius Max. iv. i. 1 De Moderatione. Plutarch, Poplicola, xii.
10 ix. 43. Cf. Livy viii. 12. U.C. 415 B. C. 339.
11 x. 44: 33. 12 iii. 32. cf. 36.
13 iii. 110. 4. Cf. Lydus, De Magistratibus, i. 32.
14 Dio, liii. 1.

accompanied the cycle of Kalends in the Roman calendar perpetually, we may perhaps be enabled still further to illustrate the constitution and character of this year.

i. A letter is extant from Cicero to Q. Metellus Celer[y], in which he complains to him of the conduct of his brother, the tribune; both in having debarred him from the exercise of the usual privilege of addressing the people Pridie Kalendas Januarias, conceded to those who were just going out of office, and in having repeatedly denounced or accused him to the people subsequently*: Itaque ego Metello fratri tuo præsenti restiti: nam in senatu Kal. Jan. sic cum eo de republica disputavi ut sentiret sibi cum viro forti et constanti esse pugnandum. a. d. tertium Nonas Januarias cum agere cœpisset tertio quoque verbo orationis suæ me appellabat, mihi minabatur. This last statement is meant of an actio or concio of his Ad Populum on the 3rd of January. Now according to our calendar that day this year was Nundinal; and for the purpose of criminating Cicero, and of laying all the proceedings relative to the late conspiracy and the accomplices of Catiline to his charge in particular, before as large an audience as could be collected, a Nundinal day might be chosen on purpose. The third of January indeed was the

posed to be a menstrual one, not only at first but ever after. We should be of opinion that under the emperors, and when the consulship was held by individuals only for two months in general at a time, the old rule was again revived; and the alternation made menstrual as before. And this is probably the best explanation of Suetonius' statement; viz. that it had so long been the case in his time to have a monthly alternation that it might almost have been forgotten that there was ever such a thing as a daily one. It must be inferred indeed from the preceding testimonies that the consul who had not the axes at a given time had nevertheless the rods. The Fasces however absolutely, and in such a phrase as this of Fasces penes Æmilium, Fasces penes Licinium, must include the *axes* as well as the rods. And from the examples of the facts adduced above, it cannot be doubted that the rods including the axes alternated daily from one consul to the other, B. C. 216, B. C. 168, and B. C. 62.

* The factious behaviour of this tribune, Cæcilius Metellus, in these and in similar instances, caused him to be deprived of his office by a decree of the senate. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xvi. 1.

[y] Ad Fam. v. 21. Cf. Plutarch, Cicero, xxiii. Dio, xxxviii. 38. Middleton, Life, i. 242–251.

mur reliquis de rebus nihil decernere antequam publicanis responsum sit. quare etiam legationes rejectum iri puto [i]. This letter itself is dated on the Kalends of February Q. Metello et L. Afranio Coss. i. e. U. C. 694: March 19 B. C. 60. The application indeed was ultimately rejected through the influence of Cato [k]. Now this is explained most effectually by the Lustral cycle of the time. This year U.C. 694 B.C. 60 was the first year of the hundredth cycle: the year before, U. C. 693 B. C. 61, was the last of the ninety-ninth [l]. The Lustrum in question would bear date December 10 Roman U. C. 693, January 29 Julian B. C. 60. We see then that the application of the knights was made only *nine* days before the expiration of the current cycle, dated from the first of the Nundinal Martius. Their contract with the censors however would be reckoned from the Kalends of March Roman; and therefore would not expire before March 1 Roman U. C. 694 April 15 B. C. 60. The object of the application was to release them from the obligation of this engagement before the time when its fulfilment would become binding. And as that was nearly arrived, it was probably the principal reason why it was treated as a matter of so much urgency, which admitted of no delay. No doubt it was a contract which had been made with the censors of the 99th cycle, not with those of the 100th. That the 99th cycle had censors has been seen [m]; that the 100th cycle had so does not appear. Their names at least are not upon record. In any case, in the month of December Roman U. C. 693 they could not yet have been appointed. Their proper time would be Quinctilis U. C. 694. This fact however may be added to the other proofs [n] that contracts made with the censors from cycle to cycle properly bore date from the Kalends of March; and yet that the decursus of such cycles themselves, the end of one and the beginning of another, was reckoned from the Nundinal March *.

* When Cicero wrote ad Att. i. 18 this question had been pending *three* months; that is, from the Kal. of December to the Kal. of February, both inclusive. When he wrote ad Attic. ii. 1, (on the Kal. of June, or

[i] Ibid. loc. cit.
[k] Ibid. ii. 1.
[l] See Vol. ii. 331.
[m] Vol. ii. 337.
[n] Vol. ii. 275: 304.

SECTION VII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 5. 354 *days.*

U. C. 694 Varr. 693 Cap. 691 Polyb. B. C. 60.

L. Afranius
Q. Cæcilius Metellus Celer.

Kalendæ Januariæ February 18 B. C. 60. Nundinal Char. 5.

It has been seen[o] that the Kalends of January this year were earlier than March 16 B. C. 60 at least; and by our calendar they fell on February 18, 26 days before it.

There was an exhibition of gladiators on the first of June Roman this year; as we learn from Cicero[p]: Kal. Jun. eunti mihi Antium, et gladiatores M. Metelli cupide relinquenti, venit obviam puer tuus. The Kalends of June were sacred both to the Dea Carna, and to Juno Moneta, and to Mars Extra Portam Capenam, and to Tempestas[q]: yet that there were stated shows of gladiators on it is not known. In any case, the first of June U. C. 694 was not Nundinal; but the day before a Nundinal day.

We may observe that several Tesseræ gladiatoriæ, or tickets of admission to these spectacles, are still extant; which were issued this year[r]: from which it appears that there were similar exhibitions on the Kalends of April: and though that day too was sacred to Venus and to Fortuna Virilis[s] yet neither was *it* Nundinal U. C. 694 B. C. 60.

It is related by Dio of this year[t] that, after the comitia at which Cæsar and Bibulus were elected consuls, there was a

soon after,) it had been decided and in the negative; that is, against the Publicani; through the opposition to their request made by Cato. We may presume then that it was actually decided in the Roman February, before the Kalends of March. Yet it may be collected from Valerius Max. ii. x. 7 De Majestate that the question was renewed in the consular year of Cæsar B. C. 59: cf. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xx. 7–9. Appian, B. C. ii. 13.

[o] Supra, p. 22.
[p] Ad Atticum, ii. 1.
[q] Ovid, Fasti, vi. 101: 183: 191: 193. Maffæan: Venusine Calendar.
[r] Reinesius, v. lx. p. 391. Fabretti, i. No. 196. p. 37. Muratorius, ccxcii.
[s] Ovid, Fasti, iv. 133: 157: 145. Prænestine Calendar.
[t] xxxvii. 58: 54–58. Plutarch, Pompeius, xlvii. Crassus, xiv. Cæsar, xiii. Cf. Livy, ciii.

Feb. 29 B. C. 61. The only question can be about the length of the year. And here it is proper to remind the reader that in all cases of this kind, where not only the cycle of Kalends but the Nundinal cycle is concerned, there is no alternative except between the Julian dates of our calendar and other Julian dates, eight terms higher or eight terms lower at least: neither of which, at this period of the administration of the calendar, could possibly be admitted. There is no alternative then, and especially at this period, but to accept and to adopt implicitly the arrangements of our calendar. None else can possibly hold good both in the Nundinal cycle of the time and in the cycle of Kalends. The present year then must have been common; and its length the usual length of a common year, 355 days. The Kalends of January for this year consequently being known the rest of the calendar for the year is known.

In other respects, there is not much to be discovered among the particulars on record concerning this year which is calculated to illustrate the calendar. The following fact indeed is mentioned by Pliny[d] as something which occurred in it: Annalibus notatum est M. Pisone M. Messalla consulibus a. d. xiv Kalendas Octobres Domitium Ahenobarbum Ædilem Curulem ursos Numidicos centum et totidem venatores Æthiopas in Circo dedisse.

There were Ludi in Circo, according to the Julian calendar[e], xvii Kal. Oct. to xiii Kal. Oct. both inclusive; the Ludi Romani: but these appear to have been horse races or chariot races; the day before they began, xviii Kal. Octobres, being marked Equorum Probatio in Circo. In any case this exhibition was something unusual; for which reason it had been specially recorded in the public journals. The most observable circumstance connected with it is that though it came in the midst of those games it fell clear of the Nundinal day. The character of September being 3, the xii Kal. Oct. Sept. 19 Roman was Nundinal, but not xiv Kal. Sept. 17.

Another event of this year was the Triumph of Pompey, De Mithridate et Ponto; the greatest which he had yet celebrated. According to the inscription on the temple of Mi-

[d] H. N. viii. 54. p. 469. Cf. Solinus, xxvi. 10.

[e] Maffæan, Amiternine, Capranic, Antiatine.

nerva at Rome[f] which commemorated it it was celebrated iii Kal. Octobres; according to Pliny and others[g], on his birthday, Pridie Kal. Octobres. In reality it was celebrated *Per Biduum;* i. e. on both days. We may conclude then that it began iii Kal. Oct. September 28 Roman; and if so on the day after the Nundinal day, September 27. Its Julian date was November 19; that of the exhibition of Domitius previously was November 8.

There is also a letter of Cicero's to Atticus which belongs to this year[h]; dated on the Nones of December: consequently towards the end of the year. In this he speaks of a debate in the senate on the Kalends of December and on the next day, relating to a petition of the knights, (the Asiani, or such of their body as had farmed the revenues of the province of Asia,) the object of which was to release them from the terms of an improvident contract with the censors, into which they had entered: Huic quoque rei subventum est maxime a nobis ..... multaque a me de ordinum dignitate et concordia dicta sunt Kal. Decembr. et postridie. neque adhuc res confecta est, sed voluntas senatus perspecta. unus enim contra dixerat Metellus consul designatus. quin erat dicturus (ad quem propter diei brevitatem perventum non est) heros ille noster Cato.

This allusion to the consul designatus Metellus determines the time to U. C. 693 exeunte: and the Kalends of December in question to January 20 B. C. 60. At this time the days might well be represented as short. They were in fact almost as short as they could be for the latitude of Rome. But the most important circumstance is the petition of the Publicani, and the debate upon it. The two days on which it was under discussion, (December 1 and 2 Roman,) would be January 20 and 21 B. C. 60. It appears from a second letter[i] that the question was considered so important and so urgent that no other business was to take precedence of it; and even the audience of the Legationes from abroad (usual in the month of February Roman) was to be postponed, if necessary, until it was settled: Ita nos cogi-

[f] Livy, Hearnii, vi. p. 259. Pliny, vii. 27. 123. Diodorus, SS. Dep. ii. 129. xviii.

[g] Vol. ii. 91. xcviii.

[h] Ad Attic. i. 17.

[i] Ibid. i. 18.

notoriety to this act of Bibulus: though as to the ceremony of the Ejuratio itself, it must of course be gone through on the last day of the official year, whether it was Nundinal or not.

It is also to be observed of this year that Cæsar's marriage to Calpurnia, daughter of Piso, consul the next year, and that of Pompey to Julia the daughter of Cæsar, both took place in it, and about the same time in it; viz. after the consular comitia of the year, and when Piso was already consul *designatus*[b]. If so, after the xv Kal. Novembres, October 18 Roman, Nov. 17 Julian, the date of those comitia[c].

The command in Gaul too *in quinquennium* was assigned to Cæsar in this year; first that of Gallia Cisalpina and Illyricum, Lege Vatinia; and then that of Gallia Comata Per senatum[d]. It was prolonged for another *three* years, or another *five* years, Lege Trebonia, B. C. 55; and as the context of Dio implies[e] about the middle of that year. It may be collected from Cicero[f] that the epoch from which it was understood to bear date was March 1 Roman U. C. 696, March 25 B. C. 58: and though its entire duration in strictness was only *eight* years, it is generally represented at *ten*[g].

With regard to the year which follows, U. C. 696 B. C. 58, the first of this command in Gaul, it admits of being illustrated by the testimony of the calendars of the north of Europe at this time, as well as by the Roman; not only by one specific date which Cæsar himself supplies, that of the migration of the Helvetii, v Kalendas Apriles March 28 Roman, but also by a great number of minute and circumstan-

[b] Dio, xxxviii. 9. Appian, B. C. ii. 14. Plutarch, Cæsar, xiv. Pompeius, xlix. Cato Min. xxxi. xxxiii. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxi. 1. Velleius Pat. ii. 44.

[c] Cicero, Ad Attic. ii. 20: cf. 21. 15.

[d] Dio, xxxviii. 8. 41. Appian, B.C. ii. 13. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xxii. 2. Livy, ciii.

[e] xxxix. 33. 31: cf. xl. 44: xliv. 43. Appian, B. C. ii. 18. 13. 17. Livy, cv. Plutarch, Cæsar, xiv. xxi. Pompeius, xlviii. li. lii. Crassus, xiv. xv. Cato Min. xxxiii. xliii. Cicero, Ad Attic. vii. 5. 6. 9: Philipp. ii. 10, 24. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxiv. 1: xxviii. 3.

[f] Ad Fam. viii. 8: Ad Attic. v. 20: viii. 3.

[g] Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxv. 1: lxix. 1. Cicero, ad Attic. vii. 5. 7. 13: ix. 5. Florus, iv. 11, 13. Lucan, Phars. i. 283. 299, 300 374. (cf. Schol. ad i. 270). Seneca, i. 177. Ad Helviam, ix. 7. Ammianus Marc. xv. 12. Cæsar, De Bello Civ. i. 7. B. C. 50, it is spoken of as nine years. At the time of this address to his soldiers, B. C. 50, not long before the advance on the city, he had been eight years and ten months in the command, dated from March 1 Roman, B. C. 58.

tial coincidences between the Roman, the Helvetian, the Gallic, and the German or Teutonic calendar during this year. But this is a branch of our subject which we must necessarily reserve for future explanation.

In like manner the truth of our calendar for the year after this, U. C. 697 B. C. 57, has been placed beyond the possibility of a question by an infallible note of authenticity, the date of a Nundinal day, the xth Kalendas Decembres in that year, furnished by Cicero[h], a contemporary, and on the spot, (i. e. at Rome,) at the time. But forasmuch as these two years, U. C. 696 and U. C. 697 B. C. 58 and B. C. 57, include an interesting period of the personal history of Cicero, (that of his banishment from Rome,) the chronology of which has never yet been cleared up, (nor in fact without our calendar ever could have been,) we shall perhaps be excused if, with a view to the explanation of this point, we go into the consideration of these two years somewhat in detail.

i. *On the chronology of the banishment of Cicero B. C.* 58—57.

The ostensible instrument in bringing about the expatriation of Cicero was no doubt the demagogue P. Clodius; the secret instigators of Clodius, and the real efficient causes of that event in his life, were the three most powerful individuals of their time, Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus: each of whom had reasons of his own if not for desiring the death of Cicero yet for wishing to remove him for a time from Rome, and to subject him to some personal humiliation and disgrace. And these three had entered into a coalition the year before, both for other purposes which they had in view and for this one object in particular[i]: to which Cæsar attached so much importance that, though his personal presence in his province was urgently required by circumstances, he would not set out at last until Cicero was actually gone from Rome[k].

[h] Vol. ii. 36.

[i] Dio, xxxvii. 54–57: xxxviii. 10–14. Appian, B. C. ii. 9. 14, 15. Livy, ciii. Velleius Pat. ii. 44, 45. Suetonius, Julius, xix. 4: xx. 11. Auctor De Viris, Additamentum, M. Tullius Cicero. Cicero, Oratio xxix. Pro Domo, 16, 41: xxxii. Pro P. Sextio, 17, 39: 18, 41: 33, 71.

[k] Dio, xxxviii. 17. Livy, ciii. Plutarch, Cæsar, xiv. Cicero, xxx. Pompeius, xlvi. xlviii. Cato Minor, xxxiii. Cf. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. x.

great storm of wind; the effects of which are particularly described by him.

The date of these comitia is not known. But we may collect from Cicero[u] that those of B. C. 61 had not yet been held by the vi Kalendas Sextiles, Quinctilis 27 U.C. 693; and that those of B. C. 59[w] were as late as the xv Kal. Novembres October 18 Roman U. C. 695. The moon would be new B. C. 60 on November 8, September 28 Roman; and a violent storm of wind at that season of the year would be nothing extraordinary. It is probable therefore that Cæsar's comitia were held about that time. We learn hence consequently the probable date of his return from Spain this year, whither he set out October 30 B. C. 62[x]; the time too when the question of his Triumph De Lusitanis must have been under discussion: both coincidently or nearly so with the Petitio consulatus, in the month of September or early in that of October.

There is something also to be remarked on the standard of the common year, which is seen to have repeatedly gained admission into the calendar in this viith cycle; viz. that of 354 days. That such years were admissible from B. C. 200–199 downwards has been demonstrated[y]: and that many of the common years of this last cycle of the irregular calendar must have consisted *de facto* of this particular number of days and no more has been proved by actual calculation[y]. The first however of this standard which the necessity of the case requires us to recognize is the fifth year of the cycle, U. C. 694 B. C. 60: and that being the proper length of the common lunar year in the Octaëteric and even in the Metonic cycle, it is worth while at this particular juncture of time to consider in what relation the Kalends of January were standing to the lunar year. According to our General Lunar calendar, Period xiii Cycle xvi. 11, the new moon of Adar bore date February 15 at midnight, B. C. 60; and that is seen to have been true to the moon, from the solar eclipse the same year March 16 4 45 P. M. at Paris. The Kalends of January B. C. 694, February 18 B. C. 60,

[u] Ad Attic. i. 16.
[w] Ibid. ii. 20. Cf. 21: 15 Dio, xxxviii. 1. 7:9.
[x] Supra, 376.
[y] Vol. i. 490, 491.

were consequently the Luna 4[a]. It is sufficient to have pointed out the fact of that coincidence at present. We shall probably see a reason for it by-and-by.

SECTION VIII.—i. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 7. 354 *days.*

U. C. 696 Varr. 695 Cap. 693 Polyb. B. C. 58.

L. Calpurnius Piso Cæsoninus
A. Gabinius.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 28 B. C. 58. Nundinal Char. 8.

---

ii. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 8. 355 *days.*

U. C. 697 Varr. 696 Cap. 694 Polyb. B. C. 57.

P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther
Q. Cæcilius Metellus Nepos.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 17 B. C. 57. Nundinal Char. 6.

We pass over the consular year of C. Julius Cæsar and M. Calpurnius Bibulus, U. C. 695 B. C. 59; because there is nothing on record concerning it which is calculated to illustrate the calendar, unless it be the fact related of the very last day of the year: when Bibulus, Cæsar's colleague, after confining himself closely to his own house for eight months previously[z], (i. e. from the day after the passing of Cæsar's Agrarian law, which in that case must have been some time in April Roman, May 6—June 4 B. C. 59,) first made his appearance in public again; though only to discharge a duty, incumbent on those who were going out of office: Μετὰ τῆς τοῦ ὅρκου πιστώσεως καὶ περὶ τῶν παρόντων δημηγορῆσαι[a]. This would be Pridie Kal. Januarias U. C. 695, January 27 B. C. 58; and it is observable that it was also a Nundinal day, which would probably give greater solemnity and greater

[z] Livy, ciii. Dio, xxxviii. 6, 7: 1-9. Appian, B. C. ii. 10—12. Plutarch, Cæsar, xiv. Pompeius, xlviii. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xix: xx-xxii. Cicero, Ad Attic. ii. 15. 20: Orat. xxxiii. In Vatinium, 9. 21, 22.

[a] Dio, xxxviii. 12.

And hence we may probably form the first idea of the time when Cicero left Rome; the date of which has not been recorded. For if we may only assume that Cæsar would not defer his arrival in his province later than the day fixed upon for the migration of the Helvetii, March 28 Roman; then since we are told[l] he travelled with so much despatch after he had set out as to reach the Rhone, (which means the lake of Geneva,) on the *eighth* day, Ὀγδοαῖος ἐπὶ τὸν Ῥοδανὸν ἐλθεῖν, it will follow that, having already arrived at his destination by March 28, he could not have set out earlier than March 20. Neither then could Cicero have left Rome later than March 20.

But again it appears that when Cicero actually left Rome he set out at midnight[m]. The same fact might be collected from his own testimony[n]. We must conclude then that on the day of his departure there was moonlight at midnight. Now from our General Lunar Calendar, Period xiii. xvi. 13, the new moon of Veadar is seen to have fallen on March 25 at midnight, B. C. 58; and that might be confirmed by the solar eclipse the same year, July 20 11 30. P. M. Paris: and March 25 B. C. 58 at midnight was the Julian date of the Kalends of March U. C. 696. The 20th of March Roman and the 20th of this moon, at midnight, coincided also. If therefore Cicero left Rome at midnight, and not later than March 20 Roman, we may conclude with very great probability that he actually left it at midnight March 20 Roman.

But further we learn from Obsequens[o] that the day before his departure he dedicated an image of Minerva, in the Capitol; which image was afterwards blown down from its pedestal in the year of his death B.C. 43: and thereby, as Obsequens construed that coincidence[o], gave a significant intimation beforehand that his own death was not far distant. This image was dedicated under the title of Minerva Romæ Custos: Φύλαξ or Φυλακίς: Πολιοῦχος. The fact of the dedication is attested by Plutarch[p], and Dio[q], and also by himself[r]: Nos, qui illam custodem urbis omnibus ereptis nostris

[l] Plutarch, Cæsar, xvii.
[m] Plutarch, Cicero, xxxi.
[n] Oratio xxxii. Pro P. Sextio, 24, 53. 54: xxxix. Pro Rabirio, 17, 47.
[o] cxxviii. Cf. Dio, xlv. 17.
[p] Cicero, xxxi.
[q] xxxviii. 17.
[r] De Legibus, ii. 17, 42.

rebus ac perditis violari ab impiis passi non sumus, eamque ex nostra domo ipsius patris domum detulimus; judicia senatus Italiæ gentium denique omnium conservatæ patriæ consecuti sumus.

Now if this image was dedicated the day before the departure of Cicero, and the date of that departure was March 20 Roman at midnight, this image was dedicated on March 19. If so, it was dedicated on the first day of the Roman Quinquatrus, and on the very day which was supposed to be the birthday of Minerva herself[s]. And this coincidence must do much to authorize the inference that this day was purposely selected by Cicero for the dedication in question; and that conclusion too is greatly confirmed by the subsequent history of the image, to which we have already adverted: its being blown down B. C. 43. It was restored to its place after that accident on this very day; the first of the Quinquatrus, at that time also, March 19 Roman. In one of Cicero's letters Ad Familiares[t], written this year, after mentioning the Liberalia, March 17, he proceeds: Eo die non fuit senatus, neque postero. Quinquatribus (March 19) frequenti senatu caussam tuam egi non invita Minerva; etenim *eo ipso die* senatus decrevit ut Minerva nostra custos urbis quam turbo dejecerat restitueretur. No day was more likely to be fixed upon for this restoration of the image, (especially out of compliment to Cicero also,) than that on which he had himself with his own hands set it up in the Capitol. These various coincidences can scarcely leave it doubtful that he must have dedicated this image March 19 Roman, and must have left the city March 20 Roman at midnight, this year, U. C. 696 B. C. 58.

This point then being settled we proceed to the rest of the history of this exile. It appears from his own account[u] that his first intention was to have sought an asylum in Sicily; and with that object in view he repaired first of all to Vibo. But the prætor of Sicily, C. Virgilius, not daring or not choosing to afford him a refuge in the island, he was obliged to return from Vibo: and having made up his mind to go to Cyzicus in Asia[w], he went from Vibo to Brundisium.

[s] Ovid, Fasti, iii. 809–812.
[t] xii. 25.
[u] Oratio xxxi, Pro Cn. Plancio, 40, 95—41. 97. Cf. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxi. Dio, xxxviii. 17, 18.
[w] Ad Attic. iii. 2–4: 6: 15: 16:

Now the date of his arrival at Brundisium is known. There is one letter to Atticus, De Tarentino [x], dated xiv Kal. Maii: and another [y] which announces his arrival at Brundisium that same day, a. d. xiv Kal. Maii April 17 Roman. The interval therefore between the departure from Rome March 20 Roman, April 13 Julian, and this arrival at Brundisium, or as he terms it himself *under* the *walls* of Brundisium [z], April 17 Roman May 11 Julian, B. C. 58, must have been 28 days.

He tells us himself that from Vibo he travelled to Brundisium by land: Tum consilio repente mutato iter a Vibone Brundisium terra petere contendi: nam maritimos cursus præcludebat hiemis magnitudo [a]. Nor must we be surprised at his speaking of winter in the month of April *. There is a letter to Quintus his brother [b], written B. C. 56; in which also he speaks of the sea as still shut between vi Idus Apriles and iii Idus Apriles, April 11 and 14, that year. If however he travelled for this reason by land from Vibo to Brundisium; no doubt for the same reason also he must have travelled by land from Rome to Vibo. Now the distance from Rome to Vibo would not be less than 345 Roman miles direct, 385 by road; nor from Vibo to Brundisium less than 210 direct, 236 by road. Both together could not have been less than 621 by road: and both could not have been travelled on foot in less than 31 days, at the rate of 20 miles a day; nor in a carriage of any kind in less than half the time, at the rate of 40 miles a day. It is certain too that he must have stopped a longer or a shorter time at different places on the road; and some communication with the prætor of Sicily would be necessary even at Vibo, before he changed his plans. It appears from a letter to Atticus [c] that he was at Thurii (on his way from Vibo) viii Idus Apriles, April 6 Roman April 30 Julian; and from another [d], dated two days later, that he was

* The above allusion probably belongs to the month of April. At least he was at Thurii, on the road to Brundisium, before viii Idus Apriles, April 6 Roman, April 30 Julian: Ad Atticum, iii. 5.

(14:) 19: Ad Familiares, xiv. 4 Terentiæ Uxori: Oratio xxxi, Pro Plancio, 41, 100.

[x] iii. 6. [y] Ibid. 7: cf. 8. [z] Oratio xxxi, Pro Plancio, 41, 97. [a] Ibid. 40, 96. [b] ii. 6. Cf. ii. 8: 3. [c] iii. 5. [d] Ibid. 2.

In Oris Lucanis vi Id. Apriles, April 8 Roman May 2 Julian. Now Thurii was 125 Roman miles direct from Brundisium, 141 or 142 by road; and if Cicero was there April 6 and at Brundisium April 17, it must have taken him eleven days to perform that part of his journey, at the rate of thirteen miles a day: which is probably explained by the fact that this part of his journey (through Lucania[e]) was made on foot. For the preceding part of the journey (621—142 miles = 479) including the length of the stay at Vibo, whatsoever it was, we must allow the difference of 28 and 11 days, i. e. 17 days; between the departure from Rome March 20 Roman, and the arrival at Thurii April 6: and that is at the rate of 28 miles a day at least.

By the arrival at Brundisium Cicero no doubt meant his arrival at the house of his friend M. Lenius Flaccus[f]; for there is a letter extant to Terentia[g] in which he tells her Nos Brundisii apud M. Lænium Flaccum dies xiii fuimus: and the letter to Atticus, before referred to[h], which announced his arrival at Brundisium on the xiv Kalendas Maii, is dated Pridie Kalendas Maii, just *twelve* days later than the date of the arrival; and as it appears from the next to Atticus[i] just as he was leaving Brundisium again. Terentia's letter too is dated Pridie Kalendas Maii and *at* Brundisium; yet a date occurs in it, Brundisio profecti sumus a. d. v Kalendas Maii: per Macedoniam Cyzicum petebamus: which is not consistent with the dates contained in the letters to Atticus. If the date at the end of the letter to Terentia is genuine; we must suppose that the letter was begun before the departure from Brundisium, but completed and sent on the way to Thessalonica. The other, v Kalendas Maii, which occurs in it is probably in error for v Nonas Maii. The v Nonas Maii May 3 Roman would be May 26 Julian; and that was the Luna 4ta, B. C. 58. Another statement occurs in the same letter to Terentia from which we may infer that his departure from Brundisium at last was hastened from some regard to the weather: Nunc miser quomodo tuas jam litteras accipiam? quis ad me perferet? quas ego exspectassem Brundisii, si esset licitum per nautas, qui tempestatem prætermittere no-

[e] Plutarch, Cicero, xxxi. xxxii.
[f] Oratio xxxi, Pro Plancio, 41, 97.
[g] Ad Familiares, xiv. 4.
[h] iii. 7.
[i] Ibid. 8.

luerunt. Cicero had an objection, as we shall see hereafter, to put to sea before the new moon. Some correction it is evident is necessary to reconcile these dates in the letter to Terentia with those in the letters to Atticus. If Cicero arrived at Brundisium on April 17 Roman, and was thirteen days there with his friend Lenius, he could not have left it again before April 29 at the earliest. He was not gone when he wrote to Atticus on April 29; but he was going at that time, as appears from the next letter. It is most probable therefore that he actually set out on May 3, (May 26 Julian;) which was as favourable a time of the moon as any which could have been selected *.

The greatest part of the year, after this departure, was passed at Thessalonica in the house of his friend Plancius [k]. He arrived there on the x Kalendas Junii, June 15; and his first letter from that quarter is dated iv Kalendas Junias[l], six days later, June 21; the last before his return to Dyrrachium v Kalendas Novembres [m], Nov. 16 the same year. The first actually sent from Dyrrhachium was on the vi Kal. Decembres[n], Dec. 14, begun at Thessalonica but finished at Dyrrhachium: and another of the same date to Terentia [o].

ii. *On the date of the return of Cicero.*

We do not think it necessary to trace the chronology of the letters written in the course of B. C. 58 or 57, between the date of this first from Dyrrhachium and the time of the return; but we shall pass at once to the consideration of the date of the return.

* Plutarch, Vita xxxii, says that when he first put off from Brundisium to make the passage to Dyrrhachium, he was driven back by adverse winds; and set sail again and made the passage safely some time after. Possibly this may explain the difference of dates in question; if the first attempt at the passage was made v Kal. Maias, April 26 Roman, May 20 Julian, as it is in the letter to Terentia, and Cicero was driven back again that day, and did not repeat the attempt until Pridie Kal. Maias, (when he wrote both to Atticus and to Terentia,) or the next day.

[k] Oratio xxxi. 41, 98–100.
[l] Ad Attic. iii. 8.
[m] Ibid. 21. Cf. iii. 19. xvi Kal. Oct. October 5: 20. iv Non. Oct. October 23: Ad Fam. xiv. 2 Terentiæ, iii Non. Oct. October 24: Middleton, i. 388.
[n] Ad Attic. iii. 22.
[o] Ad Fam. xiv. 1. Cf. 3: Prid. Kal. Dec. Dec. 18: also Middleton, i. 396.

We must however begin with bringing together and comparing the statements which have been left on record respecting the duration of Cicero's expatriation. Κατῆλθε δὲ Κικέρων, says Plutarch [p], ἑκκαιδεκάτῳ μηνὶ μετὰ τὴν φυγήν. Appian has the same statement [q], probably after Plutarch: Ἑκκαιδεκάτῳ μάλιστα μηνὶ τῆς ἐξελεύσεως. But Dio does not repeat it [r]. Velleius Paterculus brings him back in general terms *Intra biennium* [s].

We have done enough already to satisfy the reader that Plutarch's statement must be in error. The date of Cicero's recall from banishment is known; Pridie Nonas Sextiles, U.C. 697: and though that should be understood of the very last day of the 16th month of his banishment, still it would follow from it that he could not have been banished earlier than Pridie Nonas Apriles U. C. 696. Yet we have had it under his own hand that he was already at Thurii, on his way to Brundisium, having previously been to Vibo, and travelled 479 Roman miles from Rome, only two days later than Pridie Nonas Apriles U. C. 696; viz. viii Idus Apriles, or April 6.

The truth is it might have been correct to say that Cicero returned Ἑπτακαιδεκάτῳ μηνί: but not so to say that he returned Ἑκκαιδεκάτῳ μηνί. For if he left Rome on the xiii Kal. Apriles March 20 Roman U. C. 696 April 13 B. C. 58, and was recalled Pridie Nonas Sextiles Sextilis 4 U. C. 697 August 15 B. C. 57, he had been 16 months in banishment complete on the xiii Kal. Sextiles, Quinctilis 20 U. C. 697, and 16 months 15 days on the day of his recall, Sextilis 4 the same year.

Reditus vero meus, says he himself of this recall [t], qui fuerit quis ignorat? quemadmodum mihi advenienti tamquam totius Italiæ atque ipsius patriæ dexteram porrexerint Brundisini? cum ipsis Nonis Sextilibus (August 16) idem dies adventus mei fuisset reditusque, natalis idem karissimæ filiæ quam ex gravissimo tum primum desiderio luctuque conspexi: idem etiam ipsius coloniæ Brundisinæ: idemque Salutis: cumque me domus eadem optimorum et doctissimo-

[p] Cicero, xxxiii: cf. Pompeius, xlix.
[q] B. C. ii. 16.
[r] xxxix. 6–9. Cf. Livy, civ.
[s] ii. 45.
[t] Oratio xxxii. Pro P. Sextio, 63, 131. Cf. Livy, civ.

rum virorum Lenii Flacci et patris et fratris ejus lætissima accepisset quæ proximo anno mœrens receperat—Pridie Nonas Sextiles Dyrrhachio sum profectus, ipso illo die quo lex est lata de nobis[u] (August 15*)—Brundisium veni Nonis Sextilibus[u] (August 16, one day's sail): ibi mihi Tulliola mea fuit præsto natali suo ipso die, qui casu idem natalis erat et Brundisinæ coloniæ et tuæ vicinæ Salutis[u] †: quæ res, he continues, animadversa a multitudine summa Brundisinorum gratulatione celebrata est. ante diem sextum Idus Sextiles (August 19, only four days after the passing of the law at Rome, a remarkable instance of despatch) cognovi cum Brundisii essem litteris Quinti fratris...legem comitiis centuriatis esse perlatam: and so on to Pridie Nonas Septembres, Sept. 13, and the next day, Sept. 14, when he made his first appearance again in the senate, and returned them thanks[w].

iii. *On the chronology of the remainder of U. C.* 697 *B. C.* 57.

We shall conclude our observations on the chronology of this year in general with one or two remarks more.

i. The oration Pro Domo or Apud Pontifices was delivered this year, as he himself informs us[x], Pridie Kalendas Octobres, October 8. This was not a Nundinal day. The proceedings which arose out of the decision of the pontiffs extended to Postridie Kalendas Octobres, October 10; before it could take effect.

ii. As there were at this time almost every year the most violent contentions of parties relating to the different comitia or elections; so in this year more particularly, Clodius being a candidate for the Ædileship, it was an object with the

* It is worthy of remark that this day was the Luna 7[a]; the moon being new August 9.

† He says this because the Ædes Salutis was some time or other dedicated on that day In Monte Quirinali, where Atticus' house in Rome also was situated.

[u] Ad Atticum, iv. 1. Cf. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxiii. Cf. Oratio xxviii. 11, 27, Post Reditum: xxix. Pro Domo, 28, 75.

[w] Oratio xxviii. Cf. 12, 31.

[x] Ad Atticum, iv. 2. Cf. Middleton, ii. 10–21.

friends of Cicero, especially Milo, to prevent the holding of his comitia by every means in their power*. In the course of that letter to Atticus[y], in which every day's proceedings from xii Kal. Dec. to viii Kal. Dec. are found recorded, he observes of the first day: Hæc tamen summa: nisi Milo in campum obnuntiasset, comitia futura (fuisse): ante diem xii Kal. Decembris Milo media nocte cum magna manu in campum venit...Milo permansit ad meridiem. This was Nov. 27. The moon was new Nov. 5: consequently Nov. 27 at midnight it was 22 days old complete, and would be rising at midnight†. The next day too, xi Kal. Dec. Nov. 28, Milo again preoccupied the comitium De Nocte: and there would be moonlight soon after midnight on the morning of that day also.

iii. There had been a scarcity in the year of Cicero's return, B. C. 57; on account of which the *Res frumentaria* in toto orbe terrarum, for the benefit of the republic, had been committed to Pompey In quinquennium[z]: and Cicero's brother Quintus had been appointed one of his legates, and was now gone or going in that capacity to Sardinia. In the month of December Roman this year Cicero writes to him as follows[a]: Fac si me amas ut considerate diligenterque naviges de mense Decembri. The Roman December this year began December 8. In a letter of xv Kalendas Martias (containing a variety of other dates also) he again writes to him[b]: Cura mi frater ut valeas; et quamquam est hiems tamen Sardiniam istam esse cogita. The xv Kal. Martias

* They were actually delayed till the end of January Roman U. C. 698, Jan. 25 B. C. 56. Cf. Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 2. and Dio, xxxix. 17. 16. 18.

† The year before, when the question of Cicero's recall was under discussion at Rome, it appears from Oratio xxxii. Pro Sextio, 35, 75, that on the viii Kal. Feb. U. C. 697 Feb. 8 B. C. 57 Q. Fabricius, a friend of Cicero's, Templum aliquanto ante lucem occupavit. The other party had occupied the Forum Multa de nocte. Cf. also, 35, 78. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxiii.

This implies a *late moon*, if any at all. B. C. 57 the moon was new Jan. 14; and Feb. 8 was 25 days old complete.

[y] iv. 3.

[z] Dio, xxxix. 9. 24. Livy, civ. Ad Atticum, iv. 1: cf. 2. Plutarch, Pompeius, xlix. 1.

[a] Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 1–2. Cf. Ad Fam. i. 9.

[b] Ad Quintum Frat. ii. 3.

U. C. 698 Feb. 15 Roman corresponded to Feb. 18 Julian: and it might well be said it was still in the winter at that time.

It is to be observed however that though this letter is dated at the end xv Kal. Martias yet in the course of it and not long before the end Pridie Idus occurs (Pridie Idus hæc scripsi ante lucem); which would seem to date it Feb. 12 Roman. For this reason the date at the end has been suspected. But it is not unusual for Cicero's letters to have been written on one day and to have been dated at last on another*; or (what is just the same) to have been kept open, after they had been written wholly or in part, a day or two before they were sent to their destination. This might have been the case with the present letter; viz. that it was sent two days after it was written. U. C. 698 B. C. 56 being a year of 355 days would have both a xvi Kal. Martias and a xv Kalendas Martias.

SECTION IX.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 9. 355 *days.*

U. C. 698 Varr. 697 Cap. 695 Polyb. B. C. 56.

Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus
L. Marcius Philippus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Jan. 6 B. C. 56. Nundinal Char. 3.

The Nundinal character of December U. C. 697 B. C. 57 being known; and more than one Roman date in terms of the Julian calendar this year being known; the length of the year being known; the Kalends of U. C. 698 and the Nundinal character of the year are known. The whole of this next year therefore is as good as known; and but for the plan which we laid down at the beginning of our consideration of this last period of the Irregular calendar, (that of adducing something in illustration and confirmation of almost every year in it,) we might safely dismiss it without any further remarks.

* See a clear case of that kind, Ad Q. Fratrem, iii. 1: a letter which extends over a great many days.

i. *On the Comitial characters of January and February Roman U. C.* 698: *and on the Comitia of this year.*

Three letters of Cicero are extant, addressed to P. Lentulus one of the consuls of the year of his return, and now proconsul of Cilicia, which were written at the beginning of this year, and probably on three consecutive days; and all three relate mainly to one subject, that of the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes, the father of Cleopatra, who for fear of his subjects the Egyptians had quitted Egypt and come to Rome.

The first was written on the Ides of January: Hæc Idibus mane scripsi[c]: the second the day after: Hæc scripsi a. d. xvi Kalendas Febr. ante lucem[d]: the third was most probably written the day after the second, xv Kal. Febr.[e]: since it gives an account of what had been done in the senate on the xvi Kal. Febr., and it is itself taken up by a letter to Quintus[f], dated xiv Kal. Febr.

It appears from both these letters that after the xvi Kal. Februarias there could be no more meetings of the senate for the rest of the month: Senatus haberi ante Kalendas Febr. per legem Pupiam id quod scis non potest[g]— Consecuti sunt dies comitiales, per quos senatus haberi non poterat[h]. From the collation of these passages it follows that the Lex Pupia must have prohibited the meeting of the senate on comitial days, at least in the month of Januarius; and we learn from them also that as the Fasti stood at this time all the days in this month, from the xv Kal. Februarias to the end, were comitial.

In the extant remains of the Julian calendar[i], all the days in January from the xviii Kal. (the date of the Carmentalia) exclusive are marked as comitial; two only excepted, the 29. and the 30th, the former of which was F (Fastus), the latter was N.P (Nefastus ex Parte). Now these were the two days which Cæsar introduced into this month, in order to add to its length. Consequently they made no part of it at this time. And the Carmentalia being always the day but one

[c] Ad Fam. i. 1.
[d] Ibid. 2.
[e] Ibid. 4.
[f] ii. 2.
[g] Ad Fam. i. 3.
[h] Ad Quint. Fr. ii. 2.
[i] Maffæan, Prænestine.

after the Ides, January 15, the reckoning of comitial days even in the old calendar could not have begun from an earlier date than xv Kal. Februarias January 16; from which it appears to have actually begun at this time.

In like manner, we collect from a letter to Quintus[k], written B. C. 54, that as the Fasti then too stood several comitial days in succession followed the Quirinalia February 17: and in the extant remains of the Julian calendar[l] there are three such one after another, February 18, 19, and 20. In like manner too, by comparing the Epistles ad Atticum[m] with the Orations[n], we may infer that U. C. 697 in the year of Cicero's return there were five comitial days before or after Nonas Sextiles, Sextilis 5. Two appear in all these fragments before the Nones, Sextilis 3 and 4. A third in the Capranic on the Nones, which in the Maffæan and Amiternine is F, and in the Antiatine is N P. Two appear after the Nones, the 7 and 8th of the month, marked C in all; and the Postridie Nonas, Sextilis 6, is Fastus in the Maffæan Capranic and Amiternine, and N P in the Antiatine.

The Comitia Ædilitia, so long retarded U. C. 697, were held at last this year on the xi Kal. Jan. January 20 Roman[o] U. C. 698, January 25 B. C. 56; the day after a Nundinal day, January 19 Roman. And we may presume it could not have been long after this election before Milo was indicted by Clodius and the Tribune Cato, for his conduct in obstructing the comitia the year before. He appeared to answer that charge first on the iv Nonas Februarias[p]. On the viii Idus he appeared again; and Pompey then again spoke in his behalf[q]: and from the reception which he experienced we may probably infer that there must have been a greater attendance of people at the time than usual; which would be explained in some measure by the fact that the day was Nundinal: as our calendar shews it to have been.

Cicero's speech Pro P. Sextio also was delivered this year, Pridie Idus Martias[r]. The action against him was entered iv Idus (Februarias[s]). It was not a Nundinal day. March 10 Roman was Nundinal, but not March 14. Sextius was

[k] ii. 12.
[l] Maffæan, Prænestine.
[m] iv. 1.
[n] xxxii. Pro P. Sextio, 61, 129.
[o] Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 2.
[p] Ibid. ii. 3. Cf. Dio, xxxix. 18.
[q] Ibid. Cf. Ad Fam. i. 5.
[r] Ad Quint. ii. 4. Cf. 3.
[s] Ibid. ii. 3.

acquitted. This year however is most remarkable for a coalition between Crassus and Pompey, as Plutarch implies with the connivance of Cæsar also[t]; the object of which was to get themselves elected consuls against the next year. For this purpose, with the assistance of the seditious Tribune C. Cato, they took their measures so effectually to prevent the regular holding of any comitia[u] that even on the last day of the year no consuls had yet been appointed, Ἀλλὰ ἐνιαυτὸς οὕτω διέβη[w]. The last day of U. C. 698 was December 26 B. C. 56.

They were nominated at last Ἐκ μεσοβασιλείας[x]: i. e. Per Interregnum; but how soon after the beginning of the year does not appear. It may however be collected from Plutarch[y] that on the day of their election the mornings were dark: and the same story of the perseverance of L. Domitius, Cato's brother-in-law, one of their competitors, to the very last day of the contest, and of the violence by which he was driven from the Campus only on the morning of the election, is related by Dio and Appian[z] too.

The moon was new December 23 B. C. 56, four days before the Kalends of January, December 27. The first Interregnum would extend from January 1 Roman to January 6; December 27 B. C. 56 to January 1 B. C. 55: and any time in that interval the mornings would be dark. And the character of the year being 8, none of these days in particular would be Nundinal.

The proceedings of these Triumvirs, Crassus, Pompey, and Cæsar, accompanied with so much sedition and disorder, had doubtless begun before the usual time of the comitia U. C. 698: and as the motives by which they were actuated, and the final end to which these measures of theirs were directed, were obvious, the senate, we are told, from the very commencement of these disturbances *vestem mutavit*[a]—a thing never done except in times of the greatest uneasiness and apprehension. And they kept up this appearance of a public

[t] Cato Min. xli. Cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 46.

[u] Dio, xxxix. (16): 24—30. Livy, cv. Appian, B. C. ii. 17: 18. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxiv. 1.

[w] Dio, xxxix. 30.

[x] Ibid. 31. Cf. 27.

[y] Cato Min. xli: xlii. Pompeius, lii. Crassus, xiv. xv. Cæsar, xxi.

[z] Dio, xxxix. 31. Appian, B. C. ii. 17.

[a] Livy, cv. Dio, xxxix. 28.

mourning, or *justitium*, to the end of the year: Οὐ μέντοι οὔτε τὴν ἑσθῆτα μετημπίσχοντο, οὔτε ἐς τὰς πανηγύρεις ἐφοίτων, οὐκ ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ τῇ τοῦ Διὸς ἑορτῇ εἱστιάσθησαν, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνοχὰς τὰς Λατίνας, δεύτερον τότε ὑπό τινος οὐκ ὀρθῶς πραχθέντος ποιουμένας *, ἐς τὸ Ἀλβανὸν ἀφίκοντο [b], κ', τ. λ.

There would be a variety of Πανηγύρεις, in the regular course of things, in the latter half of the Roman year; especially the Ludi Romani and the Ludi in Circo, in September, and the Ludi Victoriæ, in October; and the Ludi Plebeii in November. That the Ludi in September in particular must have been meant may be inferred from the allusion to the Epulum Jovis in Capitolio. It appears from Dio himself[c] that there was such an Epulum and in the Capitol at the Ludi Romani; and we may infer from the fragments of the Julian calendar that its stated date was the Ides of September[d], the day on which the Capitol itself had been originally dedicated. There was also an Epulum on the Ides of November; but not an Epulum Jovis in particular; nor in fact an Epulum of stated occurrence, but Indictivum: held on that day in November, when held at all, but not necessarily every year.

As to the instauration of the Feriæ Latinæ this year, we collected from Cicero[e] that they were first celebrated about April 1–3 Roman. We collected also that they were some time or other the same year renewed. But Dio only directs us to the time when; viz. in the latter half of the year, after September 13 Roman, the Epulum Jovis in Capitolio, at least.

* Cf. Cicero, Ad Quintum Fratrem ii. 6: 4. which seems to date the instauration of the Latinæ soon after the viii Idus Apriles. If so, the coalition in question was probably concluded early in the year: one motive to it was Pompey's treatment in public, on the viii Id. Feb. (ii. 3) when he appeared to speak in behalf of Milo. In fact from Ad Fam. i. 9. we may infer that it was entered into in the month of May Roman. And Dio appears to place this instauration after the Epulum Jovis the same year; which would be after September 13 Roman: and probably that was the truth of the case.

[b] Dio, xxxix. 30. Cf. xl. 46.
[c] Ibid. xlviii. 52. 50. B. C. 37.
[d] Capranic, and Antiatine.
[e] Supra, p. 16.

SECTION X.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 10. 354 *days.*

U. C. 699 Varr. 698 Cap. 696 Polyb. B. C. 56–55.

Cn. Pompeius Magnus ii
M. Licinius Crassus ii.

Kalendæ Januariæ December 27 B. C. 56. Nundinal Char. 8.

A fragment of the Acta Diurna for this year also, Cn. Pompeio Mag. ii M. Licinio Crasso ii Coss., is extant[g]: Kal. Maii Coss. in Galliam profecti ad C. Cæsarem: which ascertains a meeting of Pompey Crassus and Cæsar after the Kalends of May this year.

This must not be confounded with the meeting of Cæsar and Crassus at Ravenna, or that of Cæsar and Pompey at Luca, the year before[h]. It may be collected from Cicero[i] that the date of this latter meeting was later than the Nones of April U. C. 698, April 8 B. C. 56, at least; before which day Pompey himself had not yet left Rome to go to Sardinia: on which occasion it was that he had this interview with Cæsar at Luca[k].

With regard to the meeting of U. C. 699 B. C. 55, the Kalends of May that year fell on April 22. If the consuls set out from Rome on this day, the meeting would take place early in May. Cæsar's fourth year in Gaul began B. C. 55[l]; and he repaired to his head quarters that year Maturius quam consuerat[m]: yet, as that could not have been before this meeting was over at least, we may infer from these facts that his usual time of taking the field in these Gallic campaigns was not earlier than the month of June; a conclusion confirmed by every thing discoverable in his own accounts, and calculated to throw any light upon the chronology of his proceedings.

[g] Dodwell, Dissertationes Camdenianæ, Appendix, 692.

[h] Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxiv. 1. Plutarch, Crassus, xiv. Pompeius, li. Cæsar, xxi. Cato Min. xli.

[i] Ad Fam. i. 9. To Lentulus, written B. C. 54, in the consular year of Appius Claudius Pulcher. Cf. ad fin.

[k] Cf. Cæs. De Bello Gall. ii. 35: iii. 1–7. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxi. Comparatio Niciæ et Crassi, iv. Cicero, Orat. xxxv. 10, 25: 11, 26.

[l] De Bello Gall. iv. 1.

[m] Ibid. iv. 6.

We shall have occasion to resume the consideration of this year, along with that of B. C. 54 and B. C. 53. We will further observe upon it at present only that it is the first of two years which the necessity of the case at this period of the administration of the irregular calendar requires to consist of 354 days. It appears both from our General Lunar Calendar, and from the eclipses noted in Pingré, that the lunar character of these five Roman years, U. C. 694 B. C. 60, U. C. 696 B. C. 58, U. C. 699 B. C. 55, U. C. 700 B. C. 54, and U. C. 701 B. C. 53, was the luna 4[a] or luna 5[a]: i. e. the Kalends of January in each of these years fell on or about the 4th or 5th of the true lunar month. Now these were the characters of the Apis cycle of the Egyptians for the time being also. And between these Roman years and the corresponding years of the Apis cycle for the time being there was as close an agreement as under the circumstances of the case was possible. This will appear from the comparison of one with the other.

Apis Cycle Type iii. Epoch Mesore 30 Nab. 442—443[n].					Irregular Roman Calendar Cycle vii.				
Cycle	Nab.	Midnight		Midn.	B.C.	B.C.		Midn.	Luna
x. 22	688	Mecheir	16	Feb. 19	60	694	Kal. Jan.	Feb. 18	4[a]
— 24	690	Tybi	25	Jan. 29	58	696	— Jan.	Jan. 28	—
xi. 1	693	Chœac	23	Dec. 27	56	699	— Jan.	Dec. 27	5[a]
— 2	694	Chœac	12	Dec. 16	55	700	— Jan.	Dec. 16	4[a]
— 3	695	Chœac	1	Dec. 5	54	701	— Jan.	Dec. 5	—

We strongly suspect that it was not accident which produced a coincidence like this in five different instances. The Apis cycle was doubtless known to Varro and Tarutius; and it was exactly in the course of these five years, as we have seen[o], that they were engaged on those inquiries relating to the year of the Foundation, the nature of which we have already explained[o], and for which the Apis cycle was wanted. These calculations appear to have been concluded in U. C. 700 B. C. 54[o]: and it is not a little remarkable that though years of the same standard of 354 days, (and years which cannot be dispensed with,) continue to enter the calendar after U. C. 700 also; their lunar characters no longer exhibit the same analogy to

[n] See our Fasti Catholici, ii. 573. [o] Supra, Diss. xv. ch. i. sect. i–iii. p. 168.

those of the Apis cycle. The first of these is U. C. 703; and the Kalends of January in that year fell on Dec. 6 B. C. 52. The new moon of Marchesvan according to our general lunar calendar, Period xiv. Cycle i. 1. B. C. 52 fell Nov. 8 at midnight; and that is shewn to have been sufficiently true to the moon by the solar eclipse October 10 the same year. Dec. 6 consequently was the 29th luna. The corresponding date in the Apis cycle, Nab. 697 cycle xi. 4 = 5, would have been Chœac 10 Dec. 13 B. C. 52, the luna 5[a] or 6[a] as before. It is clear then that the analogy between the Roman calendar and the Apis cycle ceased with U. C. 701 B. C. 53; though the nominal length of the years in the former, after U. C. 702, for many years in succession, was the same as that of those of the latter. And the best explanation of this phenomenon is that, after U. C. 700 B. C. 54, the Apis cycle was no longer wanted by Varro and Tarutius; and consequently no purpose was any longer to be served by so administering the Roman calendar as to preserve a certain prescribed relation to the Apis cycle, such as their calculations required.

SECTION XI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 11. 354 *days.*

U. C. 700 Varr. 699 Cap. 697 Polyb. B. C. 55-54.

L. Domitius Ahenobarbus
Appius Claudius Pulcher.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 16 B. C. 55. Nundinal Char. 6.

The character of the weather at the beginning of this year is alluded to in one of the Epistles of Cicero[p]: Gaudeo tibi jucundas esse meas litteras. nec tamen habuissem scribendi nunc quidem ullum argumentum nisi tuas accepissem. nam pridie Id. cum Appius senatum infrequentem coegisset tantum fuit frigus ut populi convicio coactus sit nos dimittere. The context determines this date to the Pridie Idus of February. The Julian date of that day was January 25. The same day was the full of the moon also. These two facts account for the intensity of the cold at the time. The letter continues in the same kind of tone, partly in earnest partly in jest: Et litteræ quidem ad id quod exspectas fere

[p] Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 12.

cum tuo reditu jungentur. reliqua singulorum dierum scribemus ad te si modo tabellarios tu præbebis: quamquam ejusmodi frigus impendebat ut summum periculum esset ne Appio suæ ædes urerentur. He did not it seems keep his house warm enough for such weather; and for lack of other fuel the cold was in danger of consuming its own fire place. The meaning probably is that he gave no dinners.

We collect from the next letter too [q] that there could have been no intercalation this year. It mentions the Ides of February, and the Quirinalia (xiii Kal. Martias). Comitialibus diebus qui Quirinalia sequuntur (three in number, see supra [r]) Appius interpretatur non impediri se lege Pupia quominus habeat senatum; et, quod Gabinia sanctum sit, etiam cogi ex Kal. Febr. usque ad Kal. Mart. legatis senatum quotidie dari. It concludes: Hodierni diei res gestas Lupercalibus habebis; i. e. on February 15 Roman: so that it was written between the Ides (the 13th) and the Lupercalia, the 15th; consequently on the 14th. A continuous reckoning in February Roman, from the Kalends of February to the Kalends of March, is thus ascertained: so that there could have been no Merkedonius between them. But whether the year would have 354 or 355 days is not hereby determined; and yet there is nothing in the preceding allusions to imply that it would have more than 354. Had the xvi Kal. Martias been mentioned by name, that would have implied that February must have had 28 days. As it is, there might have been no xvi Kal. Martias this year; though there was a 14th of February Roman, as usual.

The cause of Scaurus defended by Cicero (though the oration delivered on that occasion has been lost) was one of the events of this year. He was preparing for it before the v Kalendas Sextiles [s]. The date of the action has been preserved by Asconius [t]; a. d. iv Nonas Septembres: and that of the accusation or of the entry of the action against him, Postridie Nonas Quinctiles [u], a few days after his return to Rome Ad petitionem consulatus [w]. The most observable

[q] Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 13.
[r] Page 395.
[s] Ad Attic. iv. 15: Ad Quintum Frat. ii. 16.
[t] Pag. 131. Cf. Ad Quintum Fratr. iii. 1.
[u] Pag. 132.
[w] Cf. Ad. Attic. iv. 16.

circumstance in the history of this action is that which Asconius mentions at the end of his commentary on the oration: Cato prætor judicium quia æstate agebatur sine tunica exercuit, campestri sub toga cinctus. in forum quoque sic descenderat jusque dicebat: idque repererat ex vetere consuetudine, secundum quam et Romuli ætatis statuæ in Capitolio et in rostris Camilli fuerant togatæ sine tunicis[x].

This allusion to the summer, and to the warmth of the weather implied in it, is explained by our calendar; according to which iv Nonas Septembres the date of the action was August 10. It was however a Nundinal day. The heat would be great for the meridian of Rome on August 10, in any year. But *this* year it appears to have been something unusual even there; as we learn from the testimony of Cicero himself. He was complaining of the heat of the weather even before the case came on[y], soon after the Idus Quinctiles[z]; and when it was over he wrote to his brother as follows[a]: Ego ex magnis caloribus, (non enim meminimus majores,) in Arpinati summa cum amœnitate fluminis me refeci ludorum diebus, (the Ludi Romani, Sept. 4–12 Roman, August 12–20)—In Arcano a. d. iiii Id. Sept. fui (August 18,)...aquamque...non longe a villa belle sane fluentem vidi, præsertim maxima siccitate. And between this date and the Ides, August 21, there is another allusion to the summer, when he was now in the Fundus Fufidianus, which he had just bought of the owner Fufidius, while he was at Arpinum, for his brother Quintus. Ego locum æstate umbrosiorem vidi numquam: permultis locis aquam profluentem et eam uberem. That all this was later than the defence of Scaurus appears from what he also observes in the same letter: Orationes efflagitatas pro Scauro et pro Plancio absolvi—Scaurum beneficio defensionis valde obligavi[a].

On the contrary, further on in this same book of the Epistles to Quintus[b], we meet with an allusion to a great inundation of the Tiber the same year; which appears to have coincided critically with the time of the acquittal of Gabinius: consequently on the occasion of his first trial; for he was not

[x] Cf. Pliny, H. N. xxxiv. 11. p. 214. Valerius Max. ii. vi. 7 De Illustribus qui in veste &c.

[y] Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 16.

[z] Cf. Ad Quintum, ii. 15; Ad Attic. iv. 15, 16.

[a] iii. 1.

[b] iii. 7.

acquitted on the second [c]. Romæ et maxime Appia ad Martis mira proluvies: Crassipedis ambulatio ablata, horti, tabernæ plurimæ. magna vis aquæ usque ad piscinam publicam. viget illud Homeri,

> Ἦμαρ ὀπωρινῷ ὅτε λαβρότατον χέει ὕδωρ
> Ζεύς—

cadit enim in absolutionem Gabinii:

> Ὅτε δή γ' ἄνδρεσσι κοτεσσάμενος χαλεπαίνῃ
> οἳ βίῃ εἰν ἀγορῇ σκολιὰς κρίνωσι θέμιστας,
> ἐκ δὲ δίκην ἐλάσωσι θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες [d].

It is singular that though this inundation and its effects are mentioned by Dio also, and in connection with this trial of Gabinius too [e], yet he appears to date it soon after the beginning of the present consular year; that of Lucius Domitius and Appius Claudius. This testimony of Cicero clearly determines it to the autumnal equinox, or about that time. The acquittal of Gabinius on his first trial is announced to his brother in a letter which is dated ix Kal. Novembres [f], October 24 Roman, September 30 Julian, this year. After the autumnal equinox both rain and an inundation of the Tiber would be very possible events; and the weather might break with more violence at last because of the unusual heat and drought of the summer before.

As to Gabinius, he returned from the east to Rome on the xii Kal. Octobres [g]; but he entered the city first only on the iv Kal. Octobres, Sept. 27 Roman, Sept. 4 Julian: and when he did so, it was by night and unperceived [g]. This proves that he was studiously avoiding notice, and therefore that he must have selected a dark night. The moon was new September 4 B. C. 54 itself. The chronology of his case might easily be traced through the two next epistles to Quintus [h]. But it is sufficient to know that on this first occasion, when Cicero himself appeared as a witness against him, he must

c Dio, xxxix. 62, 63: cf. 55. 59.

d Iliad. Π. (xvi.) 385. Cf. Schol. in loc. Τῷ μετοπωρινῷ· καὶ γὰρ ὄμβρος πολὺς κατὰ τὸ μετόπωρον γίνεται.

e xxxix. 60, 61: cf. xl. 1.

f Ad Quintum, iii. 4. 9. Cf. Ad Attic. iv. 16, 17.

g Ad Quintum, iii. 1, 2. Dio, xxxix. 62. Ad Quintum, iii. 2, Cicero seems to reckon the vi Id. Octobres, October 10 Roman, the tenth day from Gabinius' first citation. It would be so, if reckoned from the Kalends of October, two days after Sept. 27 Roman, on the night of which he entered the city.

h Ad Quintum, iii. 2, 3.

have been tried and acquitted between September 4 and September 30.

On the Chronology of Julius Cæsar's second expedition to Britain.

We shall conclude the account of this year with a brief review of the chronology of the second British expedition of Julius Cæsar, as far as it admits of being ascertained and illustrated from the epistles of Cicero; for this too was one of the events of the year, and, to the inhabitants of this island at the present day, it must be the most interesting of all.

Quintus, Cicero's brother, was one of the legates or lieutenants of Cæsar; and served under him both in this British campaign, and in the proceedings which ensued the same year in Gaul after it was over. But it does not appear that he joined the army under him before U. C. 700 B. C. 54. There is a letter to Atticus extant[i], from which it may be inferred that he was still in Italy, Nonis Maiis April 17, that year; and another[k] which seems to imply that he was already on his way to Cæsar, only three days later, vi Idus Maias April 20. Cicero himself alludes to a letter from his brother, written at Ariminum[l] and received between vi Idus Maias and the Kalends of June (May 12) next ensuing; and to two others, received iiii Non. Jun. May 13, one from Placentia in Etruria, the other from Blandino[m] (in Illyricum[n]): and we must conclude that he was then on the road to Cæsar, and probably, when the last letter was written, had just joined him in Illyricum. That he was actually with Cæsar, before the British expedition this year, appears from Cicero's correspondence with Lentulus, proconsul of Cilicia, this year B. C. 54 itself[o].

After this, and, as the context implies, on the vi Kalendas Sextiles July 6, Cicero writes to Atticus[p]; Ex Quinti fratris litteris suspicor jam eum esse in Britannia: a conjecture which turns out to have been very near the truth: and there is a letter to his brother himself[q], which must have been

[i] iv. 9. [k] iv. 14: cf. 16. [o] Cf. Ad Fam. i. 9. [p] iv. 15.
[l] Ad Quint. ii. 14. [m] Ibid. 15. [q] Ad Quint. ii. 16. Cf. Ad Attic. iv. 15, 16.
[n] D'Anville, i. 142.

written later than this to Atticus yet in the same month, from which it appears that Cicero had just heard from him, and that he was then in Britain: O jucundas mihi tuas de Britannia litteras! timebam oceanum, timebam litus insulæ. Between the iv Idus Septembres too and the Ides[r], he again writes to Quintus: De Britannicis rebus cognovi ex tuis litteris nihil esse nec quod metuamus nec quod gaudeamus: which is perhaps to be understood as much in reference to the expedition of the preceding year, as to that which was then going on.

But the first date which fixes a time when Cæsar and Quintus were actually now in Britain is one which also occurs in this letter[s]: Quarta epistola mihi reddita est Id. Sept. quam a. d. iiii Id. Sextiles ex Britannia dederas. This letter then had been written in Britain on July 20; and it was received by Cicero In Arpinati on August 21, just 32 days after date.

In this same letter he announces also the receipt of another on the xi Kalendas Septembres, according to the present reading of the text; on the twentieth day after date. But the necessity of the case requires that instead of xi Kal. Sept. we should read xi Kal. Octobres, September 20 Roman, August 28 Julian; for the context of this letter to Quintus itself had got down to xii Kal. Octobres, (Sept. 19 Roman August 27 Julian,) before the mention of this other comes in. It must therefore have been written in Britain on or about the first of September Roman, August 9.

At the end of this letter to Quintus too he mentions the arrival of letters from Cæsar himself[s]: Ex Britannia Cæsar ad me Kal. Sept. dedit litteras; quas ego accepi a. d. iiii Kal. Octobres: written consequently on August 9, and received on Sept. 4: 26 days after date. Cæsar at that time had moved down to the sea shore; for Cicero continues: Satis commodas de Britannicis rebus: quibus, ne admirer quod a te nullas acceperim, scribit se sine te fuisse cum ad mare accesserit. And this serves to explain how it might have happened that Quintus' letter, though written on the same day as this of

[r] Ad Quint. iii. 1. Cicero received *three* letters from Quintus all at once, while he was in Arpinati on this occasion; i. e. between iv Id. Sept. and the Ides.

[s] Ad Quintum Fratr. iii. 1.

Cæsar, or on the day after it, came to hand 19 or 20 days after date, Cæsar's only in 26. They were not sent by the same post; nor from the same quarter in Britain.

The next letter of Cicero's which bears on this subject is one to Atticus[t], dated Kal. Oct. September 7, three days after the receipt of the letter from Cæsar. In this he recognizes both the preceding letters: Ex fratris litteris incredibilia quædam de Cæsaris in me amore cognovi: eaque sunt ipsius Cæsaris uberrimis litteris confirmata. Britannici belli exitus exspectatur. constat enim aditus insulæ esse munitos mirificis molibus. etiam illud jam cognitum est, neque argenti scrupulum esse ullum in illa insula neque ullam spem prædæ nisi ex mancipiis; ex quibus nullos puto te litteris aut musicis eruditos exspectare.

Lastly in the next letter to Atticus[u] he writes again: Ab Quinto fratre et a Cæsare accepi a. d. ix Kalendas Novembres litteras, confecta Britannia, obsidibus acceptis, nulla præda, imperata tamen pecunia: datas a litoribus Britanniæ proximo (*corrige* proximis). a. d. vi Kal. Octob. exercitum Britannia reportabant: that is, dated September 2, received September 30, B. C. 54.

We have evidence therefore in the letters of Cicero that Cæsar and Quintus were both in Britain from the iv Idus Sextiles to the vi Kalendas Octobres U. C. 700, July 20 to September 2 B. C. 54, at least. In the words last quoted however (Datas a litoribus Britanniæ proximo a. d. vi Kal. Oct.) there is an ambiguity as the text stands at present, which would be removed by reading proximis (to agree with litoribus), instead of proximo used as if *absolutely*, in the sense of the vi Kal. Oct. *last past;* of which use of *proximo* no instance is to be found in Cicero, nor, as we much question, in any classical writer in the Latin language.

We construe these words ourselves to imply that the letter in question was dated not from the coast of Britain, but from the opposite coast of Gaul, the point on the continent nearest to Britain, yet over against it; and therefore on one of the two days which we know from the testimony of Cæsar himself[w] to have been devoted to the transport of the army back from Britain to Gaul: and just in the interim when one part

[t] iv. 16. [u] iv. 17. [w] De Bello Gallico, v. 23.

of the army had actually been conveyed back, but they were still waiting for the other. It is here to be observed that in the next letter to Atticus[x], reverting to this topic, Cicero says to him: Perspice æquitatem animi mei...et mehercule cum Cæsare suavissimam conjunctionem...qui quidem Quintum meum tuumque Dii boni! quemadmodum tractat honore dignitate gratia: non secus ac si ego essem imperator. hiberna legionum eligendi optio delata commodum ut ad me scribit. If so, in Quintus' letter just received ix Kal. Nov. Sept. 30, and dated Sept. 2. For it was actually the case that when the army was transported back from Britain it was going into winter quarters; and Cæsar it seems had given Quintus the privilege of choosing his own: though it does not appear that he had yet made his choice. It serves to explain all this still further that as we learn from Cæsar himself (De Bello Gallico) Quintus Cicero's health was not good at this very time; and it was no doubt a matter of some importance to him personally in what part of the climate of Gaul he should pass the winter: the first too which he could yet have passed in that country.

There is a letter extant to Quintus himself[y] dated ix Kal. Novembres also, consequently on the same day as that to Atticus[z], in which he observes, Hæc scripsi a. d. ix Kal. Nov. quo die ludi committebantur, in Tusculanum proficiscens*. It does not appear that when this was written Quintus' own of vi Kal. Oct. (Sept. 2) had yet been received. We must therefore conclude that it arrived the same day; after *this* letter had been sent off: though before that to Atticus had been written also[z]. The first letter to Quintus, which by recognizing the receipt of later information from the same quarter and on the same subjects recognizes the previous receipt of this letter, comes later[a]; and Cicero was then aware that his brother's winter quarters were to be among the Nervii: as in

* There were no Ludi of stated occurrence on the ix Kal. Novembres. These games therefore must have been extra ordinem: and we may collect from ad Quintum iii 8 and 9, that they were games so given by Milo; at this time a candidate for the consulship. Probably for the first time: for iii. 8 on the viii Kal. Dec. speaks of his doing it then or preparing to do it for the second or third time.

[x] iv. 18. [y] iii. 4. [z] iv. 17. [a] iii. 8.

fact we know from the testimony of Cæsar, in the account of the subsequent rising of the Gauls, that they actually were: Tu velim cures ut sciam quibus nos dare oporteat eas quas ad te deinde litteras mittemus: Cæsarisne tabellariis, ut is ad te protinus mittat, an Labieni. ubi enim isti sint Nervii et quam longe absint nescio*.

* We know from the De Bello Gallico of Cæsar himself how soon this return of the army from Britain, B. C. 54, and its disposal in winter quarters, was followed by the formidable insurrection of the Gauls, which placed so many of his Legates in such imminent danger, and Cicero's brother Quintus among the rest. To the best of our judgment this rising took place at the full of the moon of September, next after the return from Britain; that is on or after September 18 this year.

It is plainly to be collected from the first part of this answer of Cicero's to his brother[1], that the latter had written to him in a desponding or querulous strain; implying that he was not very easy in his situation at the time, or not very well satisfied with it. And it is probable that in entering the service of Cæsar he had acted more in deference to his brother's wishes than to his own inclinations; for Cicero himself was anxious to stand well with both Cæsar and Pompey: and perhaps thought he should promote that object by sending his brother to Cæsar, while he himself stayed in the neighbourhood of Pompey at Rome. But it is clearly not such a letter as he *must* have written had he been aware of his brother's danger at the time. The letter was written *on* or *after* iix Kal. Decembres (a date which occurs in it in terms) Nov. 23 Roman October 30 Julian; just one month after Sept. 30 when he announced to Atticus the arrival of the letters from Quintus of the date of Sept. 2. He might very well have fresh letters from Quintus written between Sept. 2 and 18, which might not reach him until after Sept. 30 at least. There is an instance B. C. 44 when letters from Gaul[2] were not received at Rome in less than 20 or 21 days after date. But it is not likely that he would hear again from him, after Sept. 18, until the rising of the Gauls had been suppressed, and he himself had been liberated from the danger in which he had thereby been placed. And it does not appear, from the De Bello Gallico of Cæsar, that that could have been the case before the middle of October. Between the return to Gaul, Sept. 2, and Sept. 18, Quintus might write several letters; and several from him seem to be recognized Ad Quint. iii. 5–9. It is a curious coincidence that in some one of these he must have told his brother he had written four tragedies in 16 days[3]; one of which appears to have been entitled Erigone. This was the very number of days between the return from Britain Sept. 2, and the rising of the Gauls, as we suppose, Sept. 18; after which we may be sure Quintus had something else to do than to amuse himself by writing tragedies, and at the rate of one in four days.

The supplications alluded to in this letter to Quintus[4] could be for no

[1] iii. 8. [2] Ad Attic. xiv. 9. [3] Ad Quintum, iii. 6 et iii. 9. [4] iii. 8.

Another event of this year, and one pregnant with consequences of great importance to the future by dissolving the

successes in Gaul this year; much less for the suppression of the insurrection in question: but they might be for the supposed successes in Britain, or for those of Crassus, B. C. 54 also. Twenty days had been decreed the year before for the result of the first expedition[5]. The supplicatio, so often mentioned in Roman history, is defined by Polybius[6], Τὸ σχολάζειν πανδημεὶ καὶ θύειν τοῖς θεοῖς χαριστήρια.

In fact there is nothing discoverable, as far as we know, in any of the letters of Cicero of this period, which would imply that it must have been written after the critical state of things in Gaul had come to be known in Rome; and during its continuance. The only passage in any of them which might suggest a doubt on that point is the following[7]: Sed me illa cura sollicitat angitque vehementer, quod dierum jam amplius L intervallo nihil a te, nihil a Cæsare, nihil ex istis locis, non modo litterarum sed ne rumoris quidem affluxit. me autem jam et mare istuc et terra sollicitat: neque desino ut fit in amore ea quæ minime volo cogitare. quare non equidem jam te rogo ut ad me de te de rebus istis scribas, (nunquam enim cum potes prætermittis,) sed hoc te scire volo, nihil fere unquam me sic exspectasse ut cum hæc scribebam litteras tuas. But the allusion in this passage to the sea, to *isti loci*, indefinitely, and the like, clearly proves that this letter was written in the absence of news not from Gaul but from Britain. It concludes too; Quibus in locis et qua spe hiematurus sis ad me quam diligentissime scribas velim: from which it appears he did not yet know where he was to winter, much less that it was in Gaul and among the Nervii.

The reading of L for the number of days, which had passed without letters from Quintus, in this instance seems to be genuine. It is to be explained in our opinion by supposing the interval in question to have been dated from August 9, the date of the second advices from Britain; on which day both Quintus and Cæsar wrote to Cicero. For if we reckon on 50 days from August 9 we come to September 28, xi Kal. Nov.; two days before the actual arrival of Quintus' letter of vi Kal. Octobres Sept. 2: which Cicero received on ix Kal. Nov. Sept. 30. On this principle he must have written this letter to Quintus on the xi Kal. Nov. September 28. And that *does* seem to have been its date. The first part of it recognizes the subject matter of a former letter[8]; and the last date in that was iv Kal. Oct. Sept. 4: when Cæsar's letter from Britain of August 9 had just been received. Its date however may be collected from the reference to the approaching trial of Gabinius, which also occurs in it: Quæris quid fiet de Gabinio? sciemus de majestate *triduo*. If he was actually acquitted on this charge ix Kal. Nov.[9] the *third* day before must have been xi Kal. Nov.

[5] Cæsar, De Bello Gallico, iv. 1. 38. Dio, xxxix. 53.
[6] xxi. i. § 2.
[7] Ad Quintum, iii. 3.
[8] iii. 1.
[9] Ad Quint. iii. 4. cf. iii. 9.

only bond of union between the two principal men of the time, Cæsar and Pompey, was the death of Julia, the daughter of Cæsar and the wife of Pompey[b]; whose marriage to Pompey we noticed U. C. 695 B. C. 59[c]. We may collect from Cicero that it had recently happened, xi Kal. (Sept.) Oct. August 28[d]; and therefore that the news of it could scarcely have been received by Cæsar in Britain, as Seneca would

On *that* therefore the letter was written. Alfius the Quæsitor de majestate is mentioned in this epistle, and also in an epistle just before[10].

The trial was over when Cicero wrote to Atticus[11]; and that letter extends over a considerable space of time*. The acquittal is attributed in part to an *odor dictaturæ;* which ascertains the time of this part of this letter to Atticus, as the same with that of the letter to Quintus, of the ix Kal. Nov.[9] where the same reason is assigned for it also[12]. Pomtinus' triumph, expected on iv or iii Nonas Novembres, is alluded to in both[13]. Cicero had been one of the witnesses against Gabinius on this occasion[14].

As to the second trial when he was accused *De rebus repetundis*[15]; the case of Rabirius Postumus arose out of it[16]. Cicero had defended Gabinius on this second occasion[17]; and that being over, Rabirius' trial followed soon after. And we may judge of the time when it was going on from the following allusion to the employment of Cæsar at the same juncture, which occurs in it[18]: Multas equidem C. Cæsaris virtutes.. cognovi ...hanc vim frigorum hiememque quam nos vix hujus urbis tectis sustinemus excipere: his ipsis diebus hostem persequi cum etiam feræ latibulis se tegant, atque omnia bella jure gentium conquiescant. sunt ea quidem magna. That is, in the depth of winter U. C. 700 B. C. 54. The best commentary on this passage would be Cæsar's own account of the conclusion of the proceedings in Gaul this year, which appears to have coincided with the month of November. By this time therefore all that had happened in Gaul after the return from Britain was well known at Rome: but not as far as we can discover much before this time.

[b] Dio, xxxix. 64: cf. xxxviii. 9: xl. 44. Appian, B. C. ii. 19. Livy, cvi. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxiii: Pompeius, liii. Velleius Pat. ii. 47. Florus, iv. ii. 13. Lucan, Pharsalia, i. 111—114: iii. 10. 20. [c] Supra, 383.

[d] Ad Quintum Fratr. iii. 2: cf. also ad fin.: and iii. 8.

10 Cf. Ad Quint. iii. 1. Some day between iiii Kal. Oct. and the Kal. Also Ad Attic. iv. 16. 11 iv. 16.

12 Cf. however Valerius Max. viii. i. 3 De Judiciis Publicis.

13 Ad Attic. iv. 16: Ad Quintum, iii. 4.

14 Ad Quintum, iii. 9. 4. Ad Attic. iv. 16: Dio, xxxix. 62.

15 Cf. Cicero, xxxix Pro Rabirio.

16 xxxix. 4, 8–8, 21.

17 Ibid. 8, 19: 12, 32: 34. Dio, xxxix. 63. Valerius Max. iv. ii. 4 De Reconciliatione. 18 xxxix. 15, 42.

* It mentions the Prid. Kal. Oct. and the Kal. Oct. (on both which days part of it must have been written) and the iv Non. Nov.; and between these two last dates it recognizes the acquittal of Gabinius.

imply [e], but more probably (as Plutarch represents it [f]) just at the time of the return to Gaul (Sept. 2).

Her death is attributed to a miscarriage, occasioned according to Valerius Maximus [g] by a sudden alarm at seeing the toga of Pompey brought home covered with blood; in the midst (no doubt) of the disturbances so usual at this time in Rome, at the elections, and, in this instance, at the Comitia Ædilitia of B. C. 54: in which representation however he must have confounded something which really happened B. C. 55 [h] with the events of B. C. 54.

SECTION XII.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 12. 355 *days.*

U. C. 701 Varr. 700 Cap. 698 Polyb. B. C. 54–53.

Cn. Domitius Calvinus
M. Valerius Messalla.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 5 B. C. 54. Nundinal Char. 4.

This year is memorable as being that in which Marcus Crassus and his legions were cut off by the Parthians. The date of their destruction itself is calculated to illustrate and verify our Roman calendar of the time being in a remarkable manner. We shall therefore enter upon its consideration somewhat in detail.

In the partition of provinces, U. C. 699 B. C. 55, between the consuls of the year, Crassus and Pompey, Syria fell to the lot of the former [i]: and we are told that notwithstanding the habitual gravity and sedateness of his demeanor, yet having already conceived the design of the invasion of the Parthian empire, and already anticipating an easy conquest, and clutching in expectation the rich spoils of the east, he could not contain his joy at this piece of good fortune, as he considered it [k]. With this statement of the hope and confidence in which he was preparing to embark on a war of aggression, (for which not a shadow of excuse had been furnished by the

[e] Opp. i. 266, Ad Marciam, 14. 3. Cf. Tacitus, Ann. iii. 6.
[f] Cæsar, xxiii. Cf. Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xxvi. 1.
[g] iv. vi. 4 De Amore Conjugali.
[h] Dio, xxxix. 32. Cf. Plutarch, Pompeius, liii.
[i] Plutarch, Pompey, lii. Cf. Dio, xxxix. 33: 39. Appian, B. C. ii. 18.
[k] Plutarch, Crassus, xvi.

Parthians themselves,) merely to gratify his own cupidity; let the reader contrast the picture within two years afterwards which Plutarch has drawn, as the concluding scene in his biography of Marcus Crassus. Let him represent to his imagination the head of this same man torn from its shoulders, and exhibited at the table of the Parthian king in the hands of the Grecian actor, to personate that of Pentheus[l]. Or let him conceive that he sees the melted gold poured by the Parthians in derision down his throat[m], as if to glut the inordinate thirst of gain after death which the revenues of an empire had not been able to satisfy in his lifetime; and in the gratification of which during the brief term of his command in Syria he had spared nothing, either sacred or profane[k], and had rifled the treasures of the temple of Jerusalem itself[n]. The history of Marcus Crassus in this last episode of his existence is full of moral instruction; and is a striking proof how the vices and passions of men in the hands of a retributive Providence are often made the instruments of their own punishment. But we are concerned with it at present only as it bears on our proper purpose; that of the illustration and verification of the calendar.

i. *On the date of the departure of Crassus to Syria* U. C. 699 B. C. 55.

The first question which requires to be considered with this object in view is the date of his departure to Syria, U. C. 699 B. C. 55.

Ὁ δὲ Κράσσος, says Plutarch[o], εἰς Βρεντέσιον ἦλθεν. ἔτι δ' ἀστάτου οὔσης χειμῶνι τῆς θαλάσσης οὐ περιέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ἀνήχθη, καὶ συχνὰ τῶν πλοίων ἀπέβαλεν. The meaning of this statement at first sight is ambiguous; whether it implies that the sea was still unsettled after the winter, or after some storm of recent occurrence, some tempestuous weather not long before. We apprehend that this latter is its real meaning; and that the absence of the article before the word χειμῶνι leads to that construction only. It follows that Crassus set

[l] Ibid. xxxiii.
[m] Dio, xl. 27. Florus, iii. 11, 9: 11. Servius, Ad Æn. vii. 606. Plutarch, Crassus, ii. Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 47. p. 153.
[k] Plutarch, Crasrus, xvi.
[n] Josephus, Ant. Jud. xiv. vii. 1: De Bello, i. viii. 8.
[o] Vita, xvii.

out from Brundisium not *after* the winter, but *before* it; though probably not long before it, and at a time of the year when bad weather might be nothing extraordinary.

There is however a letter extant from Cicero to Atticus [p], dated on or after the xvii Kalendas Decembres this year, which will throw some light on this question. Nos in Tusculanum venisse a. d. xvii Kal. Decembr. video te scire. The departure of Crassus is mentioned in it as a past event, yet not later than this day xvii Kal. Decembr. B. C. 55: Crassum quidem nostrum minore dignitate aiunt profectum paludatum quam olim æqualem ejus L. Paullum iterum consulem. o hominem nequam! In what manner, and under what circumstances, Æmilius Paullus set out from Rome to Brundisium, to assume the command of the war against Perseus, we saw under the proper year [q]. What Cicero intended to contrast with that, in this departure of Crassus, at the same time of life (about 60 years of age [r]) and in the enjoyment of the same official and titular dignity of *iterum consul*, to assume this command in Syria, is no doubt the well-known fact that, though attended by Pompey his colleague [s], he quitted the gates of Rome amidst the *diræ*, execrations and curses, of the tribune Ateius Capito [t]; whereby he devoted both him and his followers to destruction.

The xvii Kal. Dec. U. C. 699 answered to Nov. 1 B. C. 55. Crassus was certainly gone before that time: but as to the question how long before, i. in a letter of Cicero's to Lentulus [u] proconsul of Cilicia U. C. 701 B. C. 54, he again alludes to this departure: Crassusque ut quasi testata populo Romano esset nostra gratia pæne a meis laribus in provinciam est profectus. nam cum mihi condixisset cœnavit apud me in mei generi Crassipedis hortis. ii. In another of the letters to Atticus [w] (which immediately precedes the last quoted) mention is made of a *cœna* or supper in the gardens of Crassipes, Quasi in diversorio, and on the Kalends of some month, as

[p] iv. 13. [q] Supra, p. 154.
[r] Plutarch, Crassus, xvii.
[s] Ibid. xvi.
[t] Plutarch, Crassus, xvi. Dio, xxxix. 39: cf. 32: 33: 35: 36. Appian, B. C. ii. 18. Cicero, De Divinat. i. 16, 29: 30. Velleius Pat. ii. 46. Lucan, Pharsalia, iii. 126. Seneca, v. 296. Nat. Quæst. v. 18. 9. Minucius Felix, vii. 4. Florus, iii. xi. 3, where this Tribune is called Metellus.
[u] Ad Fam. i. 9. p. 24: cf. p. 26, ad calc. Cf. Plutarch, Cicero, xxvi.
[w] iv. 12.

something about to take place: Sed si me diligis postridie Kalendas cœna apud me cum Pilia. prorsus id facies. Kalendis cogito in hortis Crassipedis quasi in diversorio cœnare... inde domum cœnatum.

It seems then that Cicero was to be at home, and supping at home, Postridie Kalendas; but not at home nor supping at home but in the gardens of Crassipes on the Kalends. We think then that, if he entertained Crassus before his departure, yet in *those* gardens, it must have been on *these* Kalends: and as to what Kalends, the letter which follows[x] was written so soon after, that if it was not much later than xvii Kal. Decembres, November 14 Roman, we may take it for granted that the supper in the gardens of Crassipes on some Kalends must have been on the Kalends of November. If so, October 19 B. C. 55. Crassus then had not set out before October 19 B. C. 55: but he must have done so very soon after, to justify the statement of Cicero, Pæne a meis laribus in provinciam est profectus. It is observable that B. C. 55 the moon was new October 15, four days before the Kalends of November; and there might have been a storm about that time, from the effects of which the sea might still be labouring when Crassus arrived at Brundisium. In any case, if he could not have set out before October 20 or 21, he could not have arrived at Brundisium before the end of the month: and at that time of the year bad weather would be nothing extraordinary.

A story is related by Cicero of something which occurred at Brundisium at the very time when he was embarking; and, though this may appear to be too trifling for serious notice, it seems to have been a matter of fact: and as it serves to illustrate the time of the year we shall not scruple to repeat it after him. A man it appears was crying new figs, in the port of Brundisium, when Crassus was embarking his army; and these were from Caunus in Asia, and of that year's growth. Cum M. Crassus exercitum Brundisii imponeret, quidam in portu caricas Cauno advectas vendens *Cauneas* clamitabat. dicamus si placet monitum ab eo Crassum Caveret ne iret[y] (cave ne eas, quasi Cau-ne-as). The fig

[x] iv. 13. 220, 221.

[y] De Divinatione, ii. 40, 84. Cf. Pliny, H. N. xv. 21. p.

was not ripe at this time even in Asia Minor before September; and cured or dried figs, (which are meant by caricas,) could not have been imported to Italy from that quarter before the middle or end of October. That Caunus in Caria was famous for its figs we learn from Athenæus[z].

ii. *Of the campaign in Mesopotamia* U. C. 700 B. C. 54.

It is agreed that, after Crassus' arrival in Syria B. C. 55[a], he made one expedition into Mesopotamia, which as far as it went was successful; and this was U. C. 700 B. C. 54, the year after his arrival[b]. Several towns in Mesopotamia were either reduced by force, or submitted of their own accord; though only two are mentioned by name, Nicephorium and Zenodotium or Zenodotia: to garrison which, when he returned to Antioch, a force of 7000 foot and of 1000 horse was left behind. He returned to winter in Antioch; instead of prosecuting his success and pushing on the same year to Seleucia, while the Parthians were yet unprepared to encounter him: and this was the first and most fatal oversight committed by him, in a concatenation of errors which ultimately led to his ruin.

It is agreed too that in the course of the ensuing winter, and as it was drawing to an end, (B. C. 53 *ineunte*,) he received an embassy at Antioch from the Parthian king, (whom Plutarch calls Arsaces, Herodes, and Hyrodes[c], and Cicero sometimes Orodus sometimes Orodes[d]. but whose true name was Orodes[e],) to expostulate with him for the late unprovoked and unjustifiable act of aggression; and the answer to this very just and reasonable complaint, attributed to him, is only an additional proof of his presumptuous confidence, his singular in-

[z] iii. 9. Pliny the younger, Epp. i. 7: a letter written some time, but not long, before the Ides of October, observes: Pæne præterii quod minime prætereundum fuit: accepisse me caryotas optimas (a species of dates) quæ nunc cum ficis et boletis certamen habent.

Horace observes of the month Sextilis or August,

Cum ficus prima calorque
Designatorem decorat lectoribus atris.
Epp. i. vii. 5.

Cf. Plutarch, Pompeius lxvii. Cæsar, xli: the anecdote told of Favonius, not long before the battle of Pharsalia.

[a] Plutarch, Crassus, xvii. Dio, xxxix. 60. [b] Plut. Ibid. Dio, xl. i. 12–16.

[c] Crassus, xviii. Cf. xxi. xxii. xxxiii. Antonius, xxxvii.

[d] Ad Attic. v. 18: 21: vi. 1. Ad Fam. xv. 1.

[e] Dio, xl. 16. Vell. Pat. ii. 46. Florus, iii. 11, 4.

duration, and his contemptuous disregard of right or wrong in the gratification of his cupidity. A letter of Cicero's to him is also extant [f], which was written after his departure; and most probably in B. C. 54.

iii. *On the campaign of* U. C. 701 B. C. 53.

The time when he again took the field the next year [g] is the first thing to be considered. One reason, according to Plutarch [h], for his returning to winter at Antioch the year before was because he expected his son to join him there: Δεξόμενος αὐτόθι τὸν υἱὸν ἥκοντα παρὰ Καίσαρος ἐκ Γαλατίας ...καὶ χιλίους ἱππέας ἐπιλέκτους ἄγοντα. This was no doubt his eldest son Publius Crassus; though he had another called Marcus [i]: nor can there be any doubt that before he took the field this son and the body of knights who accompanied him had actually joined him in Syria [k]; all of whom, including Publius their leader, perished in the subsequent campaign, and were in fact among the first to fall.

Now we know from the testimony of Cæsar [l] that P. Crassus was serving with him as one of his legates in Gaul, down to the beginning of U. C. 699 B. C. 55 at least; and his brother, M. Crassus, (but no longer Publius, as far as we can discover,) in B. C. 54, after the return from Britain. We may conclude then that Publius had been recalled, to assist his father in his Parthian expedition, B. C. 55 or 54. He could not therefore have joined him in Syria in time for the campaign of B. C. 54. Yet he might easily do so in time for that of B. C. 53. And in fact he had already joined him before the winter of 54. And he was with him at Hieropolis in Syria, according to Plutarch [m], when he was rifling the treasures of the Dea Syria there.

The omens or prodigies, which preceded or accompanied the opening of this campaign, after the manner of the ancients and according to the popular construction of such things at this time have been particularly mentioned [n]; but

[f] Ad Fam. v. 8.
[g] Dio, xl. 17. Vell. Pat. ii. 46. Livy, cvi. Orosius, vi. 13.
[h] Vita, xvii.
[i] Cicero, Ad Fam. v. 8. Cæsar, De Bello Gall. v. 24.
[k] Plutarch, Vita, xvii: xxv. Dio, xl. 21.
[l] De Bello Gallico, iv. 1: ii. 34: iii. 20–29: v. 24: 46: vi. 6.
[m] Vita, xvii.
[n] Dio, xl. 18. Obsequens, cxxiv. Plutarch, Vita, xviii. xix. Livy, cvi. Valerius Max. i. vi. 11 De Prodigiis, Dionysius Hal. ii. 6.

none of these would deserve any consideration for our present purpose, except such as were significant of the state of the weather at the time, and consequently would serve to throw some light on the season of the year at which the campaign was beginning. Such was the storm of thunder and lightning and wind, which the army is said to have encountered when crossing the Euphrates; for even that would be a natural phenomenon, and even for those latitudes, towards the latter end of the month of April, and about the new of the moon: to which the passage is fixed by the course of subsequent circumstances. It is observable that, though rain is not actually mentioned, a thick mist or ὁμίχλη at the time is alluded to; which argues a depression of the temperature, and possibly recent wet weather. In those quarters there is a spring or early rainy season; which terminates in the month of April[o].

It is agreed that the Romans crossed the Euphrates at the Zeugma[p]; and yet that they were encountered by the Parthians, and sustained their defeat properly so called, when they had scarcely got a day's march beyond Charræ. Now Charræ itself was only 60 Roman miles direct = $67\frac{1}{2}$ by road from the Zeugma; and that would not be more than five or six days' march at the rate of 14 miles a day. It is evident then that the campaign could scarcely have begun before it was decided. Crassus could not have been more than five or six marches from the Euphrates when he was overthrown *. It does not indeed follow that there was only five or six days' interval between the date of the passage and that of the defeat. It follows only that there could not have been less, though there might have been more. It appears in fact that

* It appears indeed from Florus, loco cit., that he marched first from the Zeugma to Nicephorium; about 82 miles direct from the Zeugma: and after that on Charræ; which was about 50 miles direct from Nicephorium. Both together would be 132 direct; 147 by road = 10 or 11 days' march at the rate of 14 miles a day. We apprehend that it was from Nicephorium that Crassus and his army were persuaded to march in the direction of Charræ, as if to encounter Surena; instead of prosecuting their route along the Euphrates to Seleucia.

o See our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. iii. 13—15.

p Plutarch, Crassus, xix. Dio, xl. 17. Florus, iii. 2, 3.

he was amused and gradually led on to his destruction by a pretended ally; but in reality a partizan and spy of the Parthians: whom Dio calls Abgarus king of Osroëne [q], Plutarch, (probably with more truth,) a Phylarch of the Arabians [r] *. The part which this man had undertaken to play would require some time; yet probably not more than ten or eleven days.

iv. *On the Roman date of the destruction of* Crassus.

Now the day of the defeat of Crassus, properly so called, the date of the first, and in fact the only, battle which was fought between the Romans and Parthians on this occasion, the battle in which they sustained their principal loss, the battle in which the younger Crassus and the flower of the army were cut off; (of which every thing else in a long tissue of disastrous consequences was but the natural and inevitable effect [s];) this day, we say, has been traditionally handed down in terms of the Roman calendar in the Fasti of Ovid.

Scilicet interdum miscentur tristia lætis
Ne populum toto pectore festa juvent.
Crassus ad Euphraten aquilas natumque suosque
Perdidit, et letho est ultimus ipse datus.
Parthe! quid exsultas? dixit dea. signa remittes:
Quique necem Crassi vindicet ultor erit [t].

The day which he is describing was the Vestalia, the feast day of Vesta [u]; which his context fixes to v Idus Junias June 9 Roman: and that is confirmed by the extant remains of the Julian calendar for the month of June [w]. The Roman Junius U. C. 701 B. C. 53, as our calendar shews, was coinciding critically with the Julian May: and the 9th of Junius was the 9th of May. *That* then was the true Julian date of

* Plutarch calls this Arabian, Ariamnes. Dio, xl. 20, seems to mean him too under the name of Alchandonius. Athenæus, vi. 61, mentions a third party whose advice was equally treacherous, and whose influence was equally fatal, Andromachus of Charræ.

[q] xl. 20. 21.
[r] xxi. xxii. Cf. Athenæus, vi. 61.
[s] Plutarch, Crassus, xxiii—xxvii. Dio, xl. 21–24.
[t] vi. 463.
[u] vi. 249 sqq.
[w] Maffæan and Venusine. Cf. Lydus, De Mensibus, iv. 59. p. 93. l. 4: and the Constantian calendar.

the *defeat,* and of the death of the younger Crassus. But it was not that of the death of the elder Crassus; which took place *three* days later: and consequently on the *twelfth* of May. The interval between the two events is distinctly specified by Plutarch; and virtually by Dio also: to prove which we cannot do better than embody the accounts of both in the form of a journal from day to day—extending over these four days, from May 9 to May 12 B. C. 53.

Chronology of the interval from the defeat of the Romans by the Parthians to the death of Crassus, B. C. 53.

i Day. v Idus Junias May 9	Battle with the Parthians, on the river or brook Βάλισσος[x]. Death of the younger Crassus, Censorinus, and Megabacchus[y]. End of the action at night[z]. The remains of the Roman army retreat to Charræ.
ii Day. iv Idus Junias May 10	Arrival of Ignatius with 300 men at Charræ at midnight[a]. The rest arrive the same night, but after him. Beginning of the second day's proceedings Ἅμα ἡμέρᾳ[b]. The day is spent by Surena in ascertaining the fact that Crassus himself was in Charræ.
iii Day. iii Idus Junias May 11	Third day's proceedings. Surena advances on Charræ[c]. At night Crassus attempts to escape to Armenia; and is purposely led astray by Andromachus[d]. Cassius his quæstor, with part of his forces, returns the same night to Charræ.
iv Day. Prid. Idus Junias May 12	The same night Cassius retreats to Syria. Octavius with his division reaches Synnaca πρὸ ἡμέρας, Crassus being still twelve stades distant from it at daybreak on the fourth day. This day he is circumvented by Surena; and killed not long before the end of the day[e].

[x] Plutarch, Vita, xxiii.
[y] Ibid. xxxiii–xxvi. Dio, xl. 21–23.
[z] Plutarch, Vita, xxvii. Dio, xl. 24.
[a] Plutarch, Vita, xxvii. Dio, xl. 24, 25.
[b] Plutarch, Vita, xxviii.
[c] Ibid. xxix.
[d] Ibid. xxix. Cf. Dio, xl. 25. Athenæus, vi. 61.
[e] Plutarch, Vita, xxx. xxxi. Dio, xl. 26, 27. 25. Livy, cvi. In Synnaca, according to Strabo, xvi. 1.

v. *On the Lunar character of the day of the death of Crassus.*

The day of the death of the elder Crassus, it thus appears from Plutarch, and from Dio also, was that which followed on the night of the attempt to retreat from Charræ, in the hope of reaching Armenia. Now Dio observes of this attempt[f]: Ὁ γὰρ Κράσσος ἀθυμήσας οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀσφαλῶς ἔθ' ὑπομεῖναι δυνήσεσθαι ἐνόμισεν . . . . καὶ ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἦν αὐτῷ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐξιόντι μὴ οὐ καταφώρῳ γενέσθαι· ἐπεχείρησε μὲν νυκτὸς ἀποδράναι, προδοθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς σελήνης πανσελήνου οὔσης οὐκ ἔλαθε. There is nothing indeed in Plutarch about the full moon on this night; but neither is there any thing to the contrary. Dio adds that Crassus, having been thus betrayed by the light of the moon on *this* night, waited until the nights were dark, before he renewed the attempt; and that would imply that he waited seven or eight days, if not fourteen or fifteen. But this statement of his in particular is so improbable in itself, and so inconsistent with the account of Plutarch, which is so much more minute and circumstantial than Dio's throughout, that we cannot hesitate to reject it. Not that even if it were true it would make any difference to the date of the death of the younger Crassus, already determined, June 9 Roman, May 9 Julian; or to that of the night of the first attempt to retreat, June 11 Roman, May 11 Julian: or consequently to the physical fact that the moon was at the full that night; to which Dio attributes the failure of that first attempt.

With respect to this fact in particular; assuming that the meridian of Charræ was about 12 or 13 minutes east of that of Jerusalem, and about 2 h. 34 m. east of that of Greenwich; we have calculated the new moon of April, B. C. 53, for that meridian, and found it April 27, at 22 h. 22 m. mean time from midnight. And this as we have already observed must have been about the time when Crassus was crossing the Euphrates, and when the weather appeared to be unsettled. In like manner, we have calculated the full moon of May for the same meridian, B. C. 53, and found it May 11 at 20 h. 35 m. mean time from midnight. Now this is the night to

[f] xl. 25.

which we have already determined the date of the first attempt of Crassus to retreat from Charræ; the night of May 11: when Dio asserted that the moon was at the full. It is manifest therefore that for this statement there must have been good foundation in the matter of fact.

But this is not all which we have to adduce in proof and in illustration of this coincidence. Cassius the quæstor of Crassus was one of those who set out with him from Charræ on this night, the night of May 11, and upon this retreat to Armenia; but, having had his suspicions of the fidelity of his guide Andromachus roused in time, he very wisely returned the same night to Charræ with his own followers; and from thence without any delay made the best of his way to Syria. Plutarch has recorded an anecdote which we believe to be authentic; and to refer to something which actually passed between him and his Arabian guides: and therefore we shall not scruple to quote it as a matter of fact. Ἐγένοντο γάρ τινες, says he[g], οἳ μηδὲν ὑγιὲς τὸν Ἀνδρόμαχον στρέφειν καὶ περιελίττειν εἰκάσαντες οὐκ ἠκολούθησαν. ἀλλὰ Κάσσιος μὲν ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Κάρρας πάλιν· καὶ τῶν ὁδηγῶν (Ἄραβες δ' ἦσαν) ἀναμένειν κελευόντων μέχρις ἂν ἡ σελήνη παραλλάξῃ τὸν Σκορπίον, Ἀλλ' ἐγώγ', εἶπὼν, μᾶλλον ἔτι τούτου φοβοῦμαι τὸν Τοξότην· ἀπήλαυνεν εἰς Ἀσσυρίαν μεθ' ἱππέων πεντακοσίων.

This anecdote is authenticated by the fact otherwise known on good authority; viz. that the Arabians from time immemorial had a prejudice against setting out on a journey when the moon was in Scorpio. It follows that on the night of May 11 B. C. 53 the moon was known to be, or supposed to be, in Scorpio. Now its actual longitude at the opposition, this very night, according to our calculation was 227°, 21′, 55″·959; i. e. in the 18° of Scorpio: and it must have continued to be in Scorpio for nearly one day longer; so that whether Cassius was setting out to Syria from Charræ before midnight May 11, or after midnight May 12, he must have been setting out while the moon was still in Scorpio: and yet in recommending him to wait until the moon had got clear of that sign his Arabian guides were not advising him to delay his departure more than one day.

g Crassus, xxix. Cf. Dio, xl. 28.

It is morally certain however, though Plutarch speaks here merely of the moon's being in Scorpio generally at this moment of time, that the Arabians to whom he alludes were thinking of the Lunar mansions; and of the moon's being at the time in some one of them which coincided with Scorpio. The Arabians had an old prejudice against beginning a journey when the moon was in these mansions in particular[h]. The Lunar mansions of the Arabians were derived from those of the Egyptians. The only difference between them was that the former were laid down in the 6th degrees of the latter, all round the sphere[i]. In the original Type of the mansions, that of the epoch, B. C. 1847, the longitude of the xvith mansion (=xviith in Type iii, that of the epoch of B. C. 847[k]) was 192° 51′ 25″·714. The interval from B. C. 1847 to B. C. 53 would be 1794 years; and in that length of time the precession in mean longitude would amount to 24° 57′ 4″·757[l]. We have then

	°	′	″
B. C. 1847 Mansion xvi in the Egyptian scheme	192	51	25·714
	+5	23	15·161
Mansion xvi in the Arabian scheme B. C. 1847;	198	14	40·875
Precession 1794 years	+24	57	4·757
Mean longitude of Mansion xvi of Type ii=xvii of Type iii B. C. 53	223	11	45·632
Mean longitude of the moon at the full May 11 B. C. 53	227	21	55·959
Mean longitude of the moon at the full in the xvii Mansion	4	10	10·327

The Arabian name of this mansion was Al Iklîl, that is the Crown; Corona *Scorpii*. That of the next to it was Al Kalb, (Cor *Scorpionis*). It is clear that the moon was in the 5th degree of Al Iklîl at the full; and would be in the 5th degree of Al Kalb in the space of the next 24 hours. These two mansions were those against which the Arabians had the greatest prejudice; particularly Al Kalb, into which the moon would pass next. This is no doubt the true explanation of the reason of the advice which they gave to Cassius; though

[h] See our Fasti Catholici, iii. 613 note. 607.
[i] Ibid. iv. 662. 665.
[k] See iii. 553.
[l] See Introduction to the Tables, Table iii. Part i. App. x.

Plutarch might not be aware of it: for the Lunar mansions of antiquity and every thing connected with them appear to have been altogether unknown to the Greeks.

vi. *On the date of the defeat of the Parthians by Ventidius.*

It is to be observed that both in the account of the proceedings before the battle, June 9 Roman May 9 Julian, and in that of the battle, there are frequent allusions to the drought and heat[m]; and to the additional sufferings of the Roman army thereby occasioned. Nor can there be any doubt that for the meridian of Charræ, and for the climate of Mesopotamia, such allusions would be perfectly natural and in character even for the month of May. But when Dio in particular[m] proceeds to explain this by supposing the battle to be going on not only in the hottest part of the day; i. e. at noon, but also in the hottest part of the year, at midsummer, (Μεσοῦντός τε γὰρ τοῦ θέρους καὶ ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ ταῦτ' ἐγίγνετο,) we may presume that he was thinking of the Roman June 9 of this time, as if actually the same with the Julian June 9 of his own time; thongh in reality a month earlier than it.

And this leads us to observe that by way of a counterpoise to the success of the Parthians on this occasion, and of a compensation for the disgrace thus brought on the Roman arms, it is usual with the contemporary historians to insist on the successes of the Romans over the Parthians under Ventidius, and on the defeat and death of Pacorus the son of Orodes himself, a few years after this defeat and death of Marcus Crassus.

The Parthian invasion of the Roman territory previous to this defeat took place U. C. 714 B. C. 40[n]; Titus Labienus, the son of the Labienus of Cæsar so often mentioned in his Gallic wars, (who fell in the battle of Munda in Spain[o], B.C. 45,) having been one of their leaders. The successes of Ventidius however were gained U. C. 715 B. C. 39 and U. C. 716 B. C. 38[p]; the last and most signal, B. C. 38: when too, by a

[m] Plutarch, Crassus, xxii. xxiii. xxv. Dio, xl. 23.

[n] Dio, xlviii. 24–26. Vell. Pat. ii. 78. Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. i. 264.

[o] Velleius Pat. ii. 52. Orosius, vi. 16.

[p] Dio, xlix. 19. 20. 21: cf. xliii. 39. 40. 41. Plutarch, Crassus, xxxiii: Antonius, xxx. xxxiii. xxxiv. Livy, cxxvii. cxxviii. Velleius Pat. ii. 78. Florus, iv. 9, 3–7. Frontinus, i. 4, 6: ii. 2, 5: v. 36, 37. Tacitus, Histor. v. 9. Germania, 37. Eutropius, vii. 3. Orosius, vi. 18. A. Gellius, xv. 4. Bre-

remarkable coincideuce, Pacorus, we are told, was defeated and killed on the same day on which the Romans under Crassus had been so B. C. 53—fifteen years before: Καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκατέρου τοῦ ἔτους ἀμφότερα συνηνέχθη[q]: i. e. nominally on the same day, June 9 Roman; though B. C. 53 that was really May 9, and B. C. 38 it was June 8.

Were we to enter on the chronology of these Parthian inroads, B. C. 39 and 38, it would be found to illustrate the account which we have given of the expedition of Crassus, B. C. 53; more especially the fact, mentioned by Frontinus[p], that the campaign of B. C. 38 on the part of the Parthians began 40 days at least before the date of their final overthrow by Ventidius. And as that was June 8, it must have begun in that case on or before April 29. So then might that of Crassus B. C. 53.

vii. *On the date of the Comitia at Rome, U. C.* 701 *B.C.* 53.

Another fact also is mentioned concerning this year; viz that the consular comitia, after being delayed through the strife and contention of parties more than six months even beyond the Kalends of January U. C. 701, were held at last, according to Dio, Ἑβδόμῳ μηνί[r], according to Appian[s], not until the eighth at least; the former Quinctilis, the latter Sextilis, U. C. 701 B. C. 53: when the consuls who represent the year in the Fasti were at length created.

We should be entirely of opinion that the true reason why the same disputes, which had prevented the regular elections for twelve months previously, ceased at this particular juncture, was the receipt of the news from Mesopotamia, of the fate of Crassus and his army. If that had befallen them only June 9–12 Roman previously, it could not have been known of at Rome before the middle of Quinctilis at the earliest; and we may easily conceive what alarm and consternation the arrival of such tidings from the east would excite at home. To recon-

viarium Sexti Rufi, cap. 18. Suidas, Πάκορος and Ἀντίρρωπον. Strabo (xvi. 2.) tells us Pacorus was killed near the city Gindarus, and the Heracleum, in the Regio Cyrrhestica, (cf. Plutarch, Antonius, xxxiv.), Pharnapates at Τραπεζών.

[p] Loc. cit. [q] Dio, xlix. 21.

[r] Ibid. xl. 17. 45.

[s] B. C. ii. 19. Cf. Plutarch, Pompeius, liv.

cile Dio with Appian, we must suppose that the comitia were held at last at the very end of Quinctilis Roman. There was even then a refractory tribune, Q. Pompeius Rufus, who would have persisted in his opposition to them[t]; but the senate ordered him to be imprisoned: a step which it would not have ventured to take except under extraordinary circumstances.

There is no letter of Cicero's extant which was written in the midst of the sensation produced by the knowledge of the fate of Crassus. We can trace the disputes relating to the comitia in his letters both B. C. 54[u] and for the first part of B. C. 53[w]; during all which time the administration of the government *de facto* was carried on Per Interreges. But we meet with no allusion in any of them to these events in the east[x]. These letters were probably suppressed after his death.

CHAPTER. II.

SECTION I.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 13. 377 *days.*

U. C. 702 Varr. 701 Cap. 699 Polyb. B. C. 53–52.

Cn. Pompeius Magnus iii
Q. Cæcilius Metellus Pius Scipio Ex Kal. Sext.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 24 B. C. 53. Nundinal Char. 1.

The calendar is authenticated and confirmed for this year beyond the possibility of doubt, by the two facts which are known from testimony concerning the year itself; i. That its Nun-

[t] Dio, xl. 45.
[u] Ad Attic. iv. 9. 15. 16. 17. 18. Ad Quintum Fratr. ii. 15. 16: iii. 1. 2. 3. 4. 8. 9.
[w] Ad Fam. vii. 11: cf. 6–18. Ad Attic. iv. 16. Ad Quint. iii. 8.
[x] Cf. De Divinatione, ii. 9, 22.

dinal character was unity[y]: ii. That it was intercalary[z]. We consider it therefore superfluous to adduce any further proofs of the truth of our arrangements for *this* year; though, were it necessary, it would be in our power to do so.

It appears then that the Nundinal incidence on the first day of the year, of which, it is to be presumed, the Pontifical college was always in dread, and against which, (as we have hitherto taken it for granted,) all their precautions in the administration of the calendar were directed, took place this year, U. C. 702, as it had done before, U. C. 676. And though we cannot suppose it was purposely allowed to happen on this occasion, any more than on the former, it is as difficult to account for its having been an accidental effect in this instance as before; especially as it might so easily have been prevented, by allowing the year before, U. C. 700 B. C. 54—53, to be a year of 354 days: according to the analogy of the two years last preceding. In this case, the Nundinal character of U. C. 702 would have been 2: and if this year notwithstanding had been intercalary (as it appears *de facto* to have been) it would have made no difference either to the Kalends of January, or to the Nundinal character, of the next year, U. C. 703 B. C. 52—51, provided the Merkedonius of *this* year, U. C. 702, had been one of 23 days instead of one of 22.

If then the effect which ensued in this instance is to be attributed to an accident or oversight of some kind, it consisted probably in the introduction of a year of 355 days into the calendar, at this period of its administration, instead of one of 354; and that oversight might easily have been committed by allowing the month of Februarius its usual complement of 28 days, instead of 27: and this might already have been done before the administrators of the calendar were aware of the consequences likely to result from it. Such an oversight would be no improbable contingency in the midst of the disputes and struggles at Rome, on the subject of the different elections; which prevailed from January to Quinctilis, and might be most violent in January and February.

It is possible too that as the special reasons, which had

[y] Vol. ii. 38. [z] Vol. i. 516.

caused the administration of the calendar from U. C. 699 to U. C. 701 to be conformed to the principles of the Apis cycle, had ceased to exist, the administrators of the calendar might think it necessary U. C. 701 to revert to the old standard of the length of the common years; without reflecting on the effect which that would have upon the Nundinal character of the next year. Be this as it may, the fact itself is certain; that the Kalends of January U. C. 702 were Nundinal: and it is equally certain that, at this period of the administration of the Irregular calendar, it could not have been the effect of any cause but *this*, of allowing U. C. 701 355 days instead of 354.

With respect to the introduction of a Merkedonius of 22 days into this year, U. C. 702, it seems to have been accidental; (the consequence at least of the events which happened in the Roman January this year itself, i. e. soon after the beginning of the year;) especially the death of Clodius on the xiii Kal. Febr. January 18 Roman, U. C. 702. But for such an unexpected event as that, and the proceedings which arose out of it, it is probable there would not have been a Merkedonius this year.

SECTION II.—i. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 14. 354 *days.*

U. C. 703 Varr. 702 Cap. 700 Polyb. B. C. 52–51.

Servius Sulpicius Rufus
M. Claudius Marcellus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Dec. 6 B. C. 52. Nundinal Char. 8.

ii. *Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 15. 354 *days.*

U. C. 704 Varr. 703 Cap. 701 Polyb. B. C. 51–50.

L. Aimilius Paullus
C. Claudius Marcellus.

Kalendæ Januariæ November 25 B. C. 51. Nundinal Char. 6.

We might, if we pleased, dispense also with the particular consideration of these two years, the limits of which are de-

termined by those of the year before and of the year after them respectively; and these either have been already ascertained or will be so hereafter. Besides which each of these years has been authenticated by coincidences pointed out in a former part of our work[a]; and specially applicable to them.

These two years however include an interesting period in the personal history of Cicero; during which he was governing the province of Cilicia aspera Proconsule. A large portion of his extant epistles, and one which abounds in dates, was written during it. It furnishes consequently such ample means for the illustration and verification of our calendar that we should not be doing justice to our proper subject, and scarcely to the truth itself, were we to pass it over altogether without notice.

We shall not however enter on the consideration of this proconsular government of Cicero's, and of its chronology, more in detail and more particularly than our purpose requires. The object which we propose in this review of it is to ascertain and point out, on the testimony of Cicero himself, the relation of the civil calendar in these two years to the natural year; which as thus defined and thus ascertained by means of contemporary testimony will be seen to be altogether the same as that of our calendar for the same two years. No kind of proof is more conclusive, and consequently more satisfactory, than this. The reader will be able to judge of the applicability of this test of the truth to our proper purpose, when he sees every indication of this description, made known by the evidence of contemporaries, explained and illustrated by the actual state of the calendar at the time.

i. *On the chronology of the Proconsular Government of Cicero.*

i. *From his departure from Rome to his arrival in his Province.*

The first of his epistles which we shall notice is one to Atticus[b], dated at Tarentum xv Kal. Junias; i. e. April 18 B. C. 51. He spent three days, there or in the vicinity, (xv–xii Kal. Jun. April 18–21,) in the company of Pompey[c].

[a] i. 490: i. 521. [b] v. 6. [c] v. 7: cf. 11. Ad Fam. ii. 8.

On the xi Kal. Junias, April 22, he set out to Brundisium[c]; where he must have arrived the same day[d].

At Brundisium, as he writes to Atticus[e], he was detained at the time of writing[e] *duodecimum jam diem*, partly by an indisposition of his own, and partly by the non-arrival of his legate Pomtinus, whom he had expected on or before the Kalends of June[f], May 2. These twelve days reckoned from xi Kal. Jun. April 22 would extend down to iii Non. Jun. May 4; and there is a letter to Appius (Pulcher[g]) his predecessor in the government of his province, whom he was going to relieve, which shews that he was still at Brundisium Pridie Nonas Junias, May 5.

The date of his actual departure from Brundisium is not on record. But it appears that he was already at Actium on the xvii Kalendas Quinctiles[h], May 15; from which we may very probably conclude that he must have set out the day before: May 14. The lunar character of this day is here to be taken into account; for at the end of the letter to Appius of the xi Kal. Junias[i], when he was waiting for Pomtinus, he observed, Qui cum venerit quæ primum navigandi nobis facultas data erit utemur. It will appear from his own testimony, B. C. 49, that he did not like to venture to sea towards the end of the moon, or when it was approaching to the change; i. e. not until after the change: and B. C. 51 the moon was new May 4 or 5; and May 14 would be the tenth or the eleventh of that moon: and if he actually set sail on that day he must have chosen the finest time of the moon in the finest month of the natural year, for the passage from Brundisium to Actium *.

From Actium he continued his journey by land[k]; and arrived at Athens on the vii Kalendas Quinctiles[l], May 25: which supposes *ten* days, (May 15 to 25,) from Actium to

* Yet Ad Attic. v. 9. he complains of not having made a very comfortable passage; and on that account tells him he had determined to travel to Athens on foot, or by land.

[c] Ibid. loc. cit.
[d] Ad Fam. iii. 3: 4.
[e] v. 8.
[f] Ad Fam. iii. 3 Appio. Cf. Ad Attic. v. 4: 5: 6.
[g] Ad Fam. iii. 4.
[h] Ad Attic. v. 9.
[i] Ad Fam. iii. 3.
[k] Ad Attic. v. 9. 11.
[l] Ibid. 10.

Athens by land. At Athens also he spent ten days[m] waiting still for Pomtinus; but as he dates his departure thence at last Pridie Nonas Quinctiles[n], June 5, we must reckon the day after his arrival, May 26, the *first*, and the day before his departure, June 4, the *last*, of the ten days spent in Athens.

June 3 was the date of the new moon of June this year: and this contributes to account for the fact which next appears; that he was six days in arriving at Delos, June 5–10. Negotium magnum est navigare, atque id mense Quinctili[n]. sexto die Delum Athenis venimus. The particulars of the voyage follow. Pridie Nonas Quinctiles (June 5) a Piræo ad Zostera vento molesto, qui nos ibidem Nonis (June 6) tenuit. a. d. viii Idus (June 7) a Ceo jucunde. inde Gyarum (June 8) sævo vento non adverso. hinc Scyrum (June 9), inde Delum (June 10): critically on the sixth day after the departure from Athens. Utroque, he concludes, citius quum vellemus cursum confecimus. Now by the Attic calendar, (Period vi. 1), he was making this voyage in the month Thargelion, from the 25th to the 30th of that month; June 5–10, B. C. 51: and at this season of the natural year, towards the end of this month and the beginning of the next to it, Skirrhophorion, the wind called Σκείρων was wont to blow; from which coincidence some of the grammarians of antiquity derived the name of the Attic month Skirrhophorion itself. The direction of that wind was Ἀπὸ πετρῶν Σκειρωνίδωῦ near Megara; and we have only to look into the maps to see that Cicero would have it behind him from Ceos to Delos; in which part of the passage he spoke of a Ventus sævus, but not adversus, which carried him forward faster than he liked.

His next letter to Atticus is dated xi Kalendas Sextiles (June 21); and he had then just got to Ephesus: Ephesum venimus a. d. xi Kalendas Sext. sexagesimo et quingentesimo post pugnum Bovillam[o]. navigavimus sine timore et sine nausea; sed tardius, propter aphractorum Rhodiorum imbecillitatem. In fact he had been sixteen days in making a voyage which might have been made in three[p]; but he purposely

[m] Ad Att. v. 11. Cf. Ad Fam. ii. 8.
[n] Ibid. 12.
[o] v. 13. Cf. Vol. i. 521.
[p] Cf. Supra, ii. 287: also our Dis-

took his time; as he wrote to Atticus while still at Delos to say he should[q]: Jam nosti ἄφρακτα Rhodiorum; nihil quod minus fluctum ferre possit. itaque erat in animo nihil festinare; Delo nec movere, nisi omnia ἀκρωτηρίων οὔρια vidissem. He probably set out at last a little before the full moon, June 17. Bibulus, proconsul of Syria the same year, was later even than Cicero in reaching his destination; as it appears that he left Ephesus for Syria only Circiter Idus Sextiles[r]; that is July 13.

The next letter to Atticus was from Tralles[rr]: Dederam Epheso pridie: has dedi Trallibus. It appears however from a letter to Appius[s] that he staid three days at Ephesus (June 21–24); and arrived at Tralles on the vi Kal. Sextiles (June 26): and consequently must have been two days on the road; which, as Ephesus and Tralles were 40 Roman miles direct=45 by road, asunder, would be nothing improbable. He must therefore have written one of the letters to Atticus[t] on the day of the departure from Ephesus (June 25), and the other[u] on the day of the arrival at Tralles (June 26.)

At this time he was expecting to reach his province before the Kalends of Sextilis (July 1): In provincia mea fore me putabam Kal. Sextilibus. ex ea die si me amas παράπηγμα ἐνιαυτοῦ commoveto[u]. And that he was travelling in the summer, in the hottest season of the year, appears from the same letter[u]: Nunc iter conficiebamus æstuosa et pulverulenta via: viz. from Ephesus through Tralles to Laodicea. He continues in the same strain to the end of this letter[u]: Habes epistolam plenam festinationis et pulveris. Our calendar explains all this. He was travelling between June 25 and July 1; i. e. critically at midsummer.

ii. *On the chronology of Cicero's Proconsular Government.*
ii. *From the time of his arrival in his province.*

The next letter announces his arrival in the province[w]: Laodiceam veni pridie Kalendas Sextiles. ex hoc die clavum

sertations on the Principles, &c. iv. 193 note. App. xix. and our Prolegomena, 255, note.

[q] v. 12.
[r] Ad Fam. xv. 3.
[rr] Ad Attic. v. 14.
[s] Ad Fam. iii. 5.
[t] v. 13. [u] Ib. 14.
[w] Ib. 15. Cf. Ad Fam. iii. 5.

anni movebis. His proconsular year therefore is to be reckoned from this date, June 30 B. C. 51, as he repeatedly observes himself[x], down to the day before it, iii Kal. Sextiles[y] U. C. 704, June 18 B. C. 50, or iiii Kal. Sextiles, June 17, as the present reading in his text has it in another instance[z].

Laodicea being 70 Roman miles direct, 78 by road, distant from Tralles; if he arrived at Tralles only on June 26, though he had spent merely part of a day there, he could scarcely have got to Laodicea before June 30. From Laodicea he set out on the iii Nonas Sextiles[a] (July 3) . . . In Castra in Lycaoniam: so that he might have passed three days (either wholly or in part) at Laodicea; as he himself, in the next to Atticus[b], gives us to understand he did: though in a subsequent letter to him[c], and in one to Cato[d], his stay there is put at two days only; probably two days complete. These trifling inconsistencies in the different parts of his correspondence, though relating to the same matters of fact, are not of much importance. The actual arrival *ad castra*, that is at Iconium, at last is dated vii Kalendas Septembres (July 24); so that, if we assume the date of the departure from Laodicea July 3, he was 21 days in getting there. Now it appears from the same epistles[e] that in the course of this interval *three* days at least were passed at Apamea, *three* at Synnada, and *three* if not more at Philomelium; *nine* or *ten* in all: and that *ten* were afterwards passed at Iconium; making up a sum total of *nineteen* or *twenty* at least. And as the entire distance from Laodicea to Iconium, through these different cities, traced on the map, would not be less than 260 Roman miles direct, 292 by road at least (=12 days' journey at the rate of 24 miles a day); it is clear that 21 days, (9+12,) at least would be wanted both for the journey from Laodicea to Iconium, and for stoppages on the road: so that if he left the former on July 3 he could not have arrived at the latter before July 24.

It is not our intention to trace his movements day by day in his province, all through this proconsular year, even if that

[x] Ad Attic. v. 16–20. 21: Ad Fam. xv. 2. 4.
[y] Ad Attic. vi. 2. 3.
[z] Ibid. v. 21.
[a] Ibid. 15.
[b] Ibid. 16.
[c] Ibid. 20. Cf. Ad Fam. iii. 8.
[d] Ad Fam. xv. 4.
[e] Ibid. Ad Attic. v. 20: cf. 16. Ad Fam. iii. 8.

could be done; but only at certain periods of its duration. It was the military season, properly so called, at this time; the *æstiva* of the year. Cicero was now on his way to the army under his command, which was encamped in summer quarters near Iconium; but he had not yet set out from Iconium to proceed to head quarters before iii Nonas Septembres[f], August 1; or at least before the Kal. Septembres[g], July 30, or Pridie Kalendas[h], July 29: for on this point there is some variation in the statements of his different epistles, according to the present reading of the text in each. He was still at Iconium, when the messengers of Antiochus king of the Comagene arrived there, either on the Kalends of September[i], July 30, or iii Non. Septembres[k], August 1. And if he arrived at Iconium July 24, and, (as we have seen,) spent *ten* days there, he could not have left it for the camp before August 2 at the earliest; whence we may very probably infer that the actual day of his departure was Aug. 2, and that the date which occurs in one of his letters[l], (Castra movi ab Iconio Pridie Kalendas Septembres,) ought to be corrected by reading Pridie Nonas Septembres (August 2.) In any case he both was and had been some time in actual motion on the xiii Kal. Octobres[m] (August 16); and was already at Cybistra on the xi Kal. Octobres[n] (August 18): and as the distance from Iconium to Cybistra was 155 Roman miles direct=175 by road, 12 or 13 days' march at 14 miles a day, he could not have arrived at Cybistra before August 14 or 15, xv or xiv Kalendas Octobres. It is doubtful, as his text stands at present[o], whether he was *three* days at Cybistra or *five*: but in two instances[o] his stay there is stated at *five* days; and the above reckoning from August 14 (xv Kal. Octobres) to August 18 (xi Kal. Octobres) implies that it must have been *five* days. Now in the letter to Atticus[p] written before this time, in which he refers to the letter to the senate[q] as already written, he observes: Delectus

[f] Ad Attic. v. 20: Ad Fam. xv. 3.
[g] Ad Fam. xv. 4.
[h] Ibid. iii. 6.
[i] Ibid. xv. 4: xv. 1 Ad Consules: Ad Attic. v. 20.
[k] Ad Fam. xv. 3.
[l] Ibid. iii. 6.
[m] Ibid. xv. 1.
[n] Ad Attic. v. 18, 19, 20. cf. vi. 1: Ad Fam. xv. 1, 2. 4.
[o] Ad Attic. v. 20: Ad Fam. xv. 2: xv. 4.
[p] v. 18: cf. vi. 1.
[q] Ad Fam. xv. 1: cf. ii. 7 Curioni. iii. 9 Appio Pulchro.

habetur civium Romanorum: frumentum ex agris in loca tuta comportatur. The harvest then was ready, but not yet secured, in the parts about Cybistra, between August 14 and August 18 B. C. 51: and if we consider the latitude of those quarters and their proximity to the Mons Taurus, that will appear to be only natural and consistent.

His arrival at Tarsus is dated a. d. iii Nonas Octobres[r], September 1. It was 93 Roman miles direct, 104 by road at least, from Cybistra to Tarsus, not less than eight days' march; and it would probably actually take up several more: as the road lay through a mountainous and difficult country; which he probably could not have marched over at a greater rate than eight or nine miles a day = 12 or 13 days in all*. We have then the account of the assault made on the inhabitants of these fastnesses in the Mons Amanus; which it seems took place in part by night, as Cicero writes to Cato[s]: Cumque me discedere ab eo monte simulassem...abessemque ab Amano iter unius diei et castra apud Epiphaniam fecissem; a. d. quartum Idus Octobris (Sept. 8) cum advesperasceret expedito exercitu ita noctu iter feci ut a. d. tertium Idus Octobres (Sept. 9) cum lucisceret in Amanum adscenderem[t]. There is not indeed any allusion here to the moon; but for the march previously and the ascent of the mountain between midnight and daybreak moonlight would be necessary. The moon was eclipsed Sept. 15 at 12. 15 A. M. Paris, B. C. 51. By our calendar it was new August 30 or 31. Consequently nine or ten days old September 9: and therefore setting about daybreak. Cicero made his night march so as to have the benefit of moonlight while on the road, and to come on the enemy just before daylight, as the moon was setting.

The last operation of the campaign was the siege and capture of Pindenissum[u], a stronghold of the Eleuthero-Cilices. In the letter to Atticus[u] its reduction is dated on the 47th

* Ad Attic. v. 19. vi. 1. being compared together lead to the inference that Cicero set out from Cybistra on the x Kal. Oct. (August 19) or the next day August 20. In which case if he arrived at Tarsus on the iii Non. Oct. (Sept. 1.) he was actually 13 days on the road.

r Ad Attic. v. 20: Cf. Ad Fam. xv. 4 Catoni: iii. 8 Appio.
s Ad Fam. xv. 4.
t Cf. ad Attic. v. 20.
u Ad Attic. v. 20. Cf. vi. 1.

day after it began to be besieged (Septimo et quadragesimo die); in that to Cato[w] on the 57th (Septimo quinquagesimo): and this seems to have been the true date. For it was taken at last on the Saturnalia[u], Dec. 17 Roman, Nov. 12 Julian. Cicero was at the foot of the mountain Sept. 9 previously; and according to one of his accounts[u] spent four days there, according to the other[u] five, before he moved again: Sept. 9–13 at least. Reckon on 57 days from Sept. 13, and you come to Nov. 9, only three days before the date of the capture Nov. 12; which might very well have been taken up in marching to the spot, and making preparations for the siege. The Saturnalia Tertia (Nov. 14) are mentioned after this[x], when the sale of the prisoners or captives, intended for slaves, was going on; and this proves that the Saturnalia had three days at least at this time, U. C. 703 B. C. 51.

And here he closes the account of his military proceedings for the year. Hinc exercitum in hiberna agri male pacati deducendum Quinto fratri dabam: ipse me Laodiceam recipiebam[y]. He had kept the field until Nov. 14 at least. Again in an epistle, written on the Ides of February[z], in the next consular year, U. C. 704, (Jan. 5 B. C. 50,) he observes: Ego æstivis confectis Q. fratrem hibernis et Ciliciæ præfeci. The time of the year explains this; for the campaign would naturally come to an end by the middle of November.

But though he spoke of his intending to return to Laodicea[x], as early as November 14, it does not appear that he left Tarsus for that purpose before the Nones of January, Nov. 29*. And in the account of his journey through Asia between that date and the Ides of February (Nov. 29 B. C. 51 and Jan. 5 B. C. 50) he alludes to a Fames, a famine or scarcity, as existing at the time: Messis enim nulla fuerat. And if that had been the case in August or September, the consequent scarcity must already have begun to be felt in November or December.

At the time too of this letter of the Ides of February, (Jan.

* Ad Attic. v. 21 he arrived at Laodicea either on the iii Id. Feb. (Jan. 3 B. C. 50) or before that day. He was there *on* that day.

w Ad Fam. xv. 4. Cf. ii. 10.
x Ad Attic. v. 20.
y Ibid. cf. Ad Fam. xv. 4 Catoni: Ad Fam. ii. 7: iii. 7 Appio.
z Ad Attic. v. 21.

5 B. C. 50,) from Laodicea[z], he tells Atticus that he was not to expect any letters from Quintus, (left In hibernis trans Taurum or trans Amanum as we have seen, Nov. 14 B. C. 51,) before the month of June Roman; A Quinto fratre his mensibus nihil exspectaris, nam Taurus propter nives ante mensem Junium transiri non potest[a]: that is not until April 21 B. C. 50, a month later than the vernal equinox; by which time the passage over Mount Taurus might again be open.

iii. *On the chronology of the Proconsular Government of Cicero.*
iii. *From the end of his year to his return to Italy.*

It remains then briefly to consider the chronology of his return from his province, U. C. 704 B. C. 50.

For this purpose we shall pass over the interval devoted to the transaction of forensic business[b] (at Laodicea); which appears to have extended from the Ides of February to the Kalends of May U. C. 704, January 5 to March 21 B. C. 50. According to a letter to Thermus[c] he was contemplating a departure from Laodicea to Cilicia, about the *Kalends* of May, March 21; Ego in Ciliciam proficisci cogito circiter Kalendas Maii: according to one to Cœlius[d], on the *Nones* of May, March 27; Mihi erat in animo.....proficisci in Ciliciam Nonis Maii.....et cum prima æstiva adtigissem militaremque rem collocassem decedere ex senatus consulto. And he says the same thing to Atticus[e]: Nonis Maii in Ciliciam cogitabam: ibi cum Junium mensem consumsissem.....Quinctilem in reditu ponere. And it is probable that he actually set out on that day; though in two letters written before[f] he seemed to think that he might be detained at Laodicea until the Ides of May.

He arrived at Tarsus Nonis Juniis[g], April 25; and at the end of that letter there is a postscript: Hæc festinans scripsi in itinere atque in agmine. There is a letter to Cœlius after this[h], dated x Kalendas Quinctiles, May 11, when he was

[z] Ad Attic. v. 21.
[a] See other allusions to the winter, Ad Fam. iii. 7 Appio: ii. 14: Ad Attic. v. 21. vi. 1.
[b] Cf. Ad Attic. v. 21: vi. 2: Ad Fam. ii. 11 Ipsis Megalensibus, (Prid. Non. April.—iiii Id.)
[c] Ad Fam. xiii. 57.
[d] Ibid. ii. 13.
[e] vi. 2.
[f] Ad Attic. v. 21: vi. 1.
[g] Ibid. vi. 4.
[h] Ad Fam. ii. 19.

still in Cilicia In castris: and one to Atticus[i], written 33 days before the end of his year (June 18), consequently May 16. And there is one to Caninius his quæstor[k], dated at Tarsus a. d. xvi Kal. Sextiles, (June 5,) consequently still in Cilicia. The true date of his departure from his province, though not from Asia, in fact was iii Nonas Sextiles, June 22 B. C. 50: Decedenti mihi et jam imperio annuo terminato ante diem iii Nonas Sextiles cum ad Sidam navi adcederem.....litteræ a meis sunt redditæ[l]: and it is observable that if he was going to embark at that time it was not before the change of the moon. The moon was new June 21 or 22 B. C. 50.

This seems to have been the true date of his departure; and reckoning from that date he might have calculated on being at Athens some time in September Roman, (July 19 to August 17,) as he appears to have thought he should be, when he wrote to Atticus at the beginning of May Roman before[m]. But the Roman September this year was falling critically within the stated time of the blowing of the Etesian winds: and that he contemplated also the possibility of his being retarded by those winds appears from a letter to Cœlius[n]; Ego nisi quid me Etesiæ morabuntur celeriter ut spero vos videbo. Accordingly it seems that by the Pridie Kal. Octobres[o], August 16, he had got no further than Ephesus; though nothing is mentioned to account for his having made so little progress on his way homeward, since June 22, (if he actually put to sea on that day,) except a visit to Rhodes[p], in order to see the two young Ciceros, (his own and his brother's son,) both of whom were studying there at this time. And even before that visit the Etesian winds had set in[f]: Ego si me navigatio non morabitur, quæ incurrebat in ipsos Etesias, propediem te ut spero videbo: and after it they were still continuing to blow: Etsi Etesiæ valde reflant[g]— Nos Etesiæ vehementissime retardarunt. detraxit xx ipsos dies etiam aphractus Rhodiorum[h]: from which it follows that he had lost more than *twenty days* on the way from Rhodes to

[i] vi. 5.
[k] Ad Fam. ii. 17. Cf. iii. 11.
[l] Ibid. iii. 12.
[m] vi. 2. cir. fin.
[n] Ad Fam. ii. 15 ad fin.
[o] Ad Attic. vi. 8: cf. x. 11.
[p] Ibid. vi. 7. Cf. v. 17: 18: 20. p. 623: Ad Fam. ii. 17: De Claris Oratt. ad Brutum, 1, 1. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxvi.
[f] Ad Fam. xv. 11.
[g] Ad Attic. vi. 7. [h] Ibid. 11.

Ephesus only; the Etesiæ blowing all the while: as they would do from July 27 to August 16 at least.

He left Ephesus, however at last Kalendis Octobribus, August 17. Kal. Octobr. Ephesi conscendentes hanc epistolam dedimus L. Tarquitio, simul e portu egredienti sed expeditius naviganti. nos Rhodiorum aphractis ceterisque longis navibus tranquillitates auspicaturi eramus. ita tamen properabamus ut non posset magis[i]. He was setting out two or three days before the new moon, August 19 or 20.

He landed in the Piræus Pridie Idus Octobres[k], August 30; having been *fourteen* days in making the passage: and he complains to Terentia of the delays, caused by the winds, down to that time itself; Pridie Idus Octobres Athenas venimus, cum sane adversis ventis usi essemus, tardeque et incommode navigassemus[l]. Nor did the Etesians usually cease before the beginning of September.

He wrote to Atticus from Athens on the Ides of October[k], August 31, the day after his arrival; and to Terentia on the xv Kal. Nov. September 3[l], four days later: and he reckoned at that time on being again in Italy Circiter Idus Novembres[l], Sept. 29. But the date of his actual landing at Brundisium was the vii Kalendas Decembres[m], October 10; Brundisium venimus vii Kal. Decembres: usi tua felicitate navigandi: ita belle nobis

Flavit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites[n].

This day was the 23rd luna; the moon having been new September 18.

The whole of this part of his return might be traced, if necessary, in the Epistles to Tiro[o], from the iii Nonas Novembres, (Sept. 19,) at least, when he arrived at Leucas, down to this day, vii Kal. Dec. (Oct. 10) when he landed at Brundisium *Hora quarta*, as he tells Tiro[p]. But it is not necessary. We will observe only that Tiro himself had been left behind him at Patræ, sick[q]; and Cicero expected it would be several days before he could be well enough again to follow him: as indeed it was. Besides the regard to his health and conva-

[i] Ad Attic. vi. 8.
[k] Ibid. 9: cf. vii. 1.
[l] Ad Fam. xiv. 5: cf. Tusculanæ, v. 8, 22.
[m] Ad Attic. vii. 2: Cf. Ad Fam. xvi. 9 Ad Tironem.
[n] See vol. i. 54, note.
[o] Ad Fam. xvi. 1—9.
[p] Ibid. 9.
[q] Cf. Ad Attic. vii. 2. Also vi. 7, when he seems to have begun to be ill.

lescence then, which he repeatedly urges upon him in the most affectionate manner[o], he reminds him of the winter, and of the risk which he might have to encounter from the voyage alone at that season of the year[r]: Cautus sis mi Tiro. mare magnum et difficile tibi restat[s]. This letter was not written before October 12; and at that time the winter might be expected soon to set in *.

SECTION III.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 16.354 *days.*

U. C. 705 Varr. U. C. 704 Cap. U. C. 702 Polyb. B. C. 50–49.

C. Claudius Marcellus
L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 14 B. C. 50.. Nundinal Char. 4.

This year was the first of the civil war of Cæsar and Pompey. We have found it of service for the illustration of our Macedo-Hellenic Calendar, and of the lunar reckoning followed by Lucan in his Pharsalia; and some of the particulars belonging to the beginning of this year, (which must otherwise have been adduced and considered at present,) because of this connection also with a distinct calendar are purposely reserved for a future opportunity.

It is however in our power to illustrate and verify the details of our Roman calendar for this particular year by many additional proofs; the sources of which are the Epistles of Cicero and the data furnished therein: and in pursuance of the plan which we began with laying down, (that of authenticating every year of the last cycle of the Irregular Period of

* Scaliger, De Emendatione, ii. 187 D, observes on this subject: Cum igitur ex iis quæ supra disputata sunt pateat Januarium priscum in Octobrem Julianum temporibus ultimis convenisse; miraberis tamen Ciceronem Tironi scribentem mense Novembri hibernam navigationem eo tempore timere: atque adeo ipsi Tironi interdicere Novembri hiberno mense navigare, quod quid cujusve modi sit quærendum relinquimus. It would indeed have been a contradiction to talk of winter in November, if January was falling in October. But in reality January was now falling partly in November partly in December.

[o] Locis cit. [r] Ad Fam. xvi. 6. [s] Ibid. 9. Cf. xvi. 12 ad fin.

the calendar by proper and independent testimonies, especially as we drew near to the time of the Julian correction,) we shall proceed to do this in the present instance, as briefly indeed as may be possible, yet as much in detail also and as circumstantially as the necessity of the case may require.

i. *On the date of the evacuation of Rome by Pompey.*

There is a letter to Atticus [t], (written on or about the vi Kal. Jan. in the preceding consular year U. C. 704, Nov. 9 B. C. 50,) in which Cicero alludes to a speech of Antony's, (now one of the tribunes of the people,) delivered on the x Kal. Jan. Nov. 5 before; i. e. eleven days after his entrance on office, iv Idus Dec. October 25.

Cicero himself returned to Rome for the first time after his landing in Italy again (vii Kal. Decembres, October 10, as we have seen,) Pridie Nonas Januarias [u]; consequently on the day after his own birthday, when he entered on his 58th year in Roman time. He arrived in the midst of the angry disputes which had been going on ever since the commencement of the Tribunician year, between the partizans of Cæsar represented by two of the Tribunes of the year, Antonius and Cassius, and one of those of the last year, Curio, and the partizans of the senate and Pompey. He was therefore on the spot at Rome when all three, Antony Cassius and Curio, under a real or a pretended apprehension for their personal safety [w], took their departure from Rome at midnight on the vii Idus Januarias (November 20) to escape to Cæsar: and he himself announces that fact to Tiro in a letter dated Pridie Idus [x] (November 25) when they had been five days gone; and when, as we hope to shew on some future opportunity, they had already arrived at Ariminum, and were found there by Cæsar himself only the next day. For this day, November 25, as we hope to shew, was the day on the night of which he crossed the Rubicon; and the day after, November 26, was that on the morning of which he occupied Ariminum. *This* was the declaration of war on his

[t] vii. 8. Cf. Ad Fam. xvi. 10, Tironi.

[u] Ad Fam. xvi. 11 Tironi. Cf. Ad Attic. vii. 4: 5: 7: 8.

[w] Cæsar, De Bello Civ. i. 5. Dio, xli. 1–4. Livy, cix. Appian, B. C. ii. 33. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxi. Antonius, v. Pompeius, lviii. Dionysius Hal. viii. 87. Orosius, vi. 15.

[x] Ad Fam. xvi. 11.

part; the beginning of the appeal to arms, the first overt act of hostility: and as soon as the news of it reached Rome it drove away Pompey, the consuls, the senate, and Cicero among the rest, by an hasty and precipitate flight[y].

The question is only At what time the first news of this act of Cæsar's would arrive at Rome? It is in our power to demonstrate, by means of the analogy of recent instances of the fact itself, that to bring tidings of any kind from Ariminum to Rome, and with whatsoever degree of despatch, would require *five* days' time. If then Ariminum was actually occupied by Cæsar on the Ides of January, November 26, the news of its occupation might be received at Rome, by great exertions of speed, on the xiv Kal. Februarias, November 30, but not before. And on *this* day it does appear to have been received.

The mind of Pompey having been previously made up with regard to the expediency of protracting the contest, and consequently of evacuating the city; and all his measures having been secretly directed with a view to such a contingency; the arrival of these tidings from Ariminum would be only the signal for his own departure from Rome: and in all probability the very same day. Accordingly there is a letter of Cicero's to Atticus[z], in which he tells him he had seen him on this very day, xiv Kal. Februarias, November 30, *plenum formidinis*; which there is no reason why we should not suppose to be a simple description of the alarm and apprehension produced by the news just received. The letter continues: Illo ipso die sensi quid ageret: which is a very significant intimation that he actually quitted Rome the same day. Nec unquam aliud in alio peccare destitit; nihil interim ad me scribere nihil nisi fugam cogitare: which is not to be understood of what passed between them at Rome on the xiv Kal. Febr. but of the policy, language, and conduct of Pompey ever after, down to the time when he left Italy itself.

Further on in this same epistle[z], (which contains extracts from various letters of Atticus' to Cicero,) quoting from one of these, of the date of x Kalendas Februarias, (December 4,) he subjoins: Hæc scribis post diem quartum quam ab urbe

[y] Cf. Ibid. 12. Philippica, ii. 21, 51–22, 53. [z] ix. 10.

discessimus. If so, the date of Cicero's departure from the city and no doubt of that of the senate in general was the xiii Kal. Februarias, December 1: and as it appears from Appian[a] and Plutarch[b] that Pompey himself departed the night *before*, and the rest on the following morning; if *they* left Rome on December 1, *he* must have left it on November 30: which confirms our conclusion respecting the actual date of his departure, as completely as can be desired. The news from Ariminum therefore reached Rome November 30; Cicero saw Pompey the same day, after it arrived: he himself (and probably the consuls) left Rome the same evening; the senate, and the rest of the influential persons who belonged to the same party, the next morning. Plutarch defines the actual time of Pompey's departure: Περὶ δείλην ὀψίαν. The moon was new November 16 B. C. 50: and therefore at the full November 30. He set out therefore by night, at the full of the moon.

ii. *On the date of the evacuation of Brundisium.*

It would not be a difficult undertaking, with the help of the letters of Cicero to make out nearly a complete diary of the proceedings from this time forward, xiii Kalendas Februarias U. C. 705, December 1 B. C. 50; for Cicero wrote to Atticus almost every day[b b], and those letters are still in existence. But there is no necessity to do this; and after all it would be a tedious process.

We will observe in reference to this subject at present only that there are two letters to Terentia and to Tullia respectively[c]; one written from Minturnæ and dated viii Kalendas *Quinctiles*, the other from Formiæ and dated simply viii Kalendas: the tenor of which is demonstrative that they must have been penned immediately after his own arrival at Formiæ and Minturnæ also. The *jurisdictio oræ maritimæ* was the post which had been assigned to Cicero[d]; and when he left Rome along with the rest it was to repair to his destination, viz. Campania. Capua was his head-quar-

[a] B. C. ii. 31.
[b] Pompeius, lxi. Cf. Dio, xli. 6–9.
[b b] Cf. Ad Attic. vii. 15. The first letter, after his departure from Rome, is vii. 10.
[c] Ad Fam. xiv. 14: 18. Cf. xvi. 12 Tironi.
[d] Ad Attic. vii. 11: 14. 16; 17–21: viii. 1. Ad Fam. xvi. 12.

ters; and Capua was five days' journey from Rome [e]. Formiæ and Minturnæ were cities of Campania, on the road to Capua also; the former three days' journey at least from Rome, the latter four: so that if he left Rome xiii Kal. Februarias, December 1, he could not have been at Formiæ before x Kal. Februarias December 4, nor at Minturnæ before ix Kal. Februarias December 5. He was actually at Formiæ x Kal. Februarias [f] and at Minturnæ viii Kal. Februarias [g] December 6. When he himself departed from Rome Terentia and Tullia were both left there [h]; and they remained at Rome until the end of January Roman at least [i]. It is evident therefore that in the letter to Terentia viii Kalendas Quinctiles must be in error for viii Kalendas Februarias The coming over of Labienus is mentioned in this very letter; and yet the date of that event itself was not long before ix Kal. Februarias [k], December 5 *.

The correspondence of Cicero consequently after his departure from Rome would begin properly with his arrival at Formiæ, on the x Kal. Februarias, December 4. But we have no occasion for our particular purpose at present to trace it *seriatim* either from this or from any other day. We shall pass to the consideration of another date which bears directly on our proper object; that of the evacuation of Brundisium, which left Julius Cæsar in possession of all Italy.

It is agreed that the Roman date of this event was the Liberalia, March 17 Roman. It is agreed too that, in 60 days' time from the first overt act of aggression on his part, (the occupation of Ariminum,) Cæsar was already in posses-

* Labienus joined Pompey and the consuls at Theanum or Teanum in Apulia (Ad Attic. vii. 13) on the ix. Kal. (Febr.). And Cicero was aware of his having left Cæsar viii Kal. when he wrote to Terentia. But Teanum was 80 miles or more distant from Capua: and still further from Minturnæ. He must therefore have come over some days before the ix Kal. (Febr.) if Cicero was already aware of the fact on the viii Kal. at Minturnæ. Cf. Ad Attic. viii. 11 (the second letter of Cicero to Pompey there given) to see that it required 7 days to bring despatches from Pompey at Canusium to Cicero at Capua. Canusium was about 30 miles further from Capua than Teanum.

[e] Cf. Procopius, De Bello Gothico, i. 14. p. 74. l. 10. Horace, Serm. i. 5. 1—46: who reaches Capua on the *sixth* day.

[f] Ad Attic. vii. 12.

[g] Ibid. vii. 13. Cf. 14.

[h] Ibid. 12: 13: 14: 16: 17. Ad Fam. xvi. 12.

[i] Ad Attic. vii. 17: 18: 20: 22. Ad Fam. xvi. 12.

[k] Ad Att. vii. 13. Cf. 14.

sion of Italy[l]. Reckon on then 60 days from November 26 B. C. 50 and you come to January 25 B. C. 49: and turn to January 25 B. C. 49, in our calendar of U. C. 705, and you find it falling on March 17 Roman that year, the xvi Kal. Apriles, the stated date of the Liberalia: and if so, the date of the evacuation of Brundisium also. Nor can there be any doubt that by Cæsar's being left master of Italy this evacuation of Brundisium is meant. The contest up to the date of that event had been waged in Italy; but after this evacuation it was never renewed on Italian ground. Spain, Epirus, Thessaly, Africa, each in its turn, became the scene of a fresh struggle; but Italy in particular never again, during this first civil war, after Pompey had once left Brundisium. The last of the sixty days then, up to which Cæsar was not yet the undisputed master of all Italy and after which he was, must have been this day of the evacuation of Brundisium; and if that was really the Liberalia March 17 Roman, U. C. 705, and that of the occupation of Ariminum was the Ides of January the same year previously, nothing can be more certain than that there were 60 days from the latter of these terms to the former in the Roman calendar of the time being, as there were from November 26 to January 25 in the Julian for the time being also. Let us then proceed to ascertain if possible how far this date of the evacuation, (the Liberalia March 17 Roman this year,) can be made out from the contemporary testimony of Cicero or of Cæsar.

Now there is a letter to Atticus[m] dated v Kalendas (Martias) Jan. 5 B. C. 49, in which Cicero thought it was probable that Pompey had already got to Brundisium from Luceria by that day; and there is another to Pompey himself[n], in answer to one received on the iii Kal. (Martias) January 7, in which it is taken for granted that he must by that time have been in Brundisium. There is also a quotation extant from a letter of Atticus' to Cicero himself[o], dated Kalendis Martiis, Jan. 9; when Pompey it is said was Quintum jam diem Brundisii. Consequently he must have arrived there on the v Kalendas Martias Feb. 24 Roman, January 5; as Cicero conjectured that he would. In like manner in a letter

[l] Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxv: lvi. Pompeius, lxii: lxiii.

[m] viii. 9.

[n] viii. 11.

[o] ix. 10.

to Atticus[p], dated vii Idus Martias Jan. 17, he reckoned that Cæsar also must have got to Brundisium by that day or the day before it; and that this calculation also was correct appears from a letter of Cæsar himself to Oppius[q]: A. d. vii Idus Martii Brundisium veni. ad murum castra posui. Pompeius est in oppido.

The length of the siege of Brundisium is stated by Cæsar[r] at *nine* days; and nine days are the interval from vii Idus Martias to xvi Kalendas Apriles, January 17 to January 25, each reckoned inclusively: and that the last day must be reckoned in these nine days as well as the first appears from the fact that the city was evacuated on the evening of January 25; or, as Cæsar himself describes the time and the circumstances of its evacuation, *silentio* and *sub noctem*[s].

The duration of the siege then was only *nine* days: yet in the course of that time various reports were circulated affirming the departure of Pompey at particular points of the intervening period[t]; all of which of course were false. One of these is represented by Cicero[u] as follows: Scripta jam epistola Capua litteræ sunt allatæ hoc exemplo. *Pompeius mare transiit cum omnibus militibus quos secum habuit. hic numerus est hominum millia xx. et consules duo et tribuni plebis et senatores qui fuerunt cum eo, omnes cum uxoribus et liberis.* conscendisse dicitur a. d. iv Nonas Martii (Jan. 12). ex ea die fuere Septemtriones venti. naves quibus usus non est omnes aut præcidisse aut incendisse dicunt. de hac re litteræ L. Metello tribuno plebis Capuam allatæ sunt ab Clodia socru, quæ ipsa transiit. This report was contradicted by him in a letter written on the Liberalia itself[w], (March 17 Jan. 25): and yet it was so circumstantially enunciated that, if we are not mistaken, it appears to have imposed on Lucan, and made him adopt it in his Pharsalia as the actual date of the departure.

Cicero himself on a subsequent occasion[x] conjectured that Pompey would probably be leaving on the day before the Quinquatrus; that is, March 18 Roman, January 26: Fuit

[p] ix. 3.
[q] ix. 13.
[r] De Bello Civili, i. 27: cf. 25–29.
[s] Ibid. 27, 28.
[t] Cf. Ad Attic. viii. 13. 16: ix. 1, 2, 3: 5, 6, 7.
[u] Ibid. ix. 6.
[w] Ibid. 9: cf. 11, 12, 13, 14.
[x] Ibid. 13: cf. 11.

enim pridie Quinquatrus egregia tempestas, qua illum usum puto: and in this conjecture he can scarcely be said to have been mistaken, since if Pompey actually set out in the evening of March 17 Roman, he must have been making the passage on the morning of March 18.

The next report made him set out on the Ides of March. Scripta epistola litteræ mihi ante lucem a Lepta Capua redditæ sunt. Idib. Mart. Pompeium a Brundisio conscendisse et Cæsarem a. d. vii. Kal. Apriles Capuæ fore[y]. But the next epistle ascertains the true date of his departure, from a letter of Matius and Trebatius enclosed in it[z]: Cum Capua exissemus in itinere audiimus Pompeium Brundisio a. d. xvi Kalendas Apriles cum omnibus copiis quas habuit profectum esse: Cæsarem *postero* die (an argument of the departure late the preceding day) in oppidum introiisse: concionatum esse: inde Romam contendisse. We may dismiss this point then as sufficiently cleared up.

iii. *On the length of the month of Februarius, U. C. 705, deducible from the above conclusions.*

As a corollary of the above conclusions it is to be inferred that the interval between the date of the occupation of Ariminum, the Ides of January U. C. 705, and that of the evacuation of Italy, the Liberalia, xvi Kal. Apriles, the same year, being *sixty* days and no more, the month of February Roman the same year must have had only 27 days. The statement of this interval, both in the Roman calendar U. C. 705, and in the Julian, B. C. 50—49, stands as follows.

U. C. 705.	Days.	B. C. 50—49.	Days.
In Januarius after the Ides	16	In November after the 26th	4
In Februarius ..	27	In December.. ..	31
In Martius	17	In January	25
Total in Roman noctidiurnal time ..	60	Total in Julian noctidiurnal time ..	60

And this is entirely consistent with the arrangements of our Irregular Roman Calendar, Period vii. Cycle 16, accord-

[y] Ad Attic. ix. 14. [z] Ibid. 15. Cf. Dio, xli. 12.

ing to which Februarius has only 27 days, and the whole year has only 354 days. On this principle there was no xvi Kalendas Martias in the Roman calendar, U. C. 705. Nor is there any evidence that there was. On the contrary, though so many dates in the months of January and February Roman this year are still to be found in Cicero's epistles, between the xiii Kal. Febr. and the Kal. Martias, (proving incontestably that there could have been no intercalation this year,) the xvi Kalendas Martias occurs no where in them. The xv Kalendas occurs[a], and the xiv Kalendas occurs; and dates in abundance between this last and the Kalends of March occur[b]: but the xvi Kalendas Martias does not occur.

A critical intimation of this fact, (i. e. of the absence of this particular term from the calendar in the present year,) appears also, if we are not mistaken, in the following passage of the letters to Atticus[c]: Etsi quum tu has litteras legeres putabam fore ut scirem jam quid Brundisii actum esset: nam Canusio viiii Kalendas profectus erat Cneius . . hæc autem scribebam pridie Nonas, xiv die postquam ille Canusio moverat &c.

On this principle the 6th of March Roman (January 14) was the fourteenth day from the ix Kal. Februarias inclusive. Reckon this latter to have been February 20 Roman, Jan. 1 Julian, and that would be actually the case: but not so if ix Kal. Febr. was Feb. 21 Roman. And though there is a various reading of viii Kalendas instead of viiii Kalendas, no one will consider that extraordinary who reflects how easily viii and viiii might be confounded one with the other. The other reading of Pridie Nonas Martias and the xivth day since the departure from Canusium must fix this reading to the viiii Kal. (Martias), and the day intended thereby to the 20th of the Roman February, not the 21st. And this reading of viiii (ix) Kalendas may be further confirmed as follows.

Pompey was at Canusium on the x Kalendas Martias[d]; on which day he wrote thence to Cicero. He had not therefore at that time set out to Brundisium, though he was preparing to do so; and so Cicero understood him to imply. The ac-

[a] Ad Attic. viii. 11, 12. [b] Ibid. 2. 5, 6. 9. 11, 12. [c] Ibid. ix. 1.
[d] Ibid. viii. 11.

tual date of his departure is declared in the following passage to Atticus[e]: 'Eodem enim die video Cæsarem a Corfinio post meridiem profectum esse, id est *Feralibus*, quo Canusio mane Pompeius. That is, by a singular coincidence both began their march to Brundisium on the same day, the *Feralia*; Pompey from Canusium in the morning, Cæsar from Corfinium in the afternoon.

The date of the Feralia, from the time of the Decemviral correction, as we have seen[f], was the ix Kalendas Martias; though before it might have been the xi Kalendas Martias. If Pompey then set out from Canusium on the Feralia, he must have done so on the ix Kalendas Martias; and as he was still at Canusium on the x Kalendas Martias, it is clear that he could not have set out before the ix Kalendas.

The proceedings at Corfinium also, before and after its capture by Cæsar, here generally referred to, confirm this date of Pompey's departure from Canusium. We learn from Cæsar himself[g] that he was detained before Corfinium Septem omnino dies[h]; and the seventh day must have been that of his march from it in the afternoon[i]. If then it surrendered on the ix Kalendas Martias Feb. 20 Roman, he must have come before it on the xv Kal. Martias February 14 Roman.

Now on the day of his arrival Domitius sent messengers to Pompey to apprize him of that fact[k]; and Pompey was then at Luceria[l]. And these messengers returned with his answer the evening before the capture of the place[m]. The distance from Corfinium to Luceria was 93 Roman miles direct = 104 by road. It would require three days to go thither, and three to return thence, six in all. And this appears to have been actually the case; these messengers having been sent on the first day of the siege and having returned on the sixth.

On this principle Domitius' advices from Corfinium must have been received by Pompey at Luceria on the xiii Kalendas Martias, February 16 Roman: and it seems that Pompey

[e] Ad Att. viii. 14.
[f] Vol. i. 427, note.
[g] De Bello Civ. i. 16—23.
[h] Ibid. 23. Cf. 18. 20—23.
[i] Cf. Ibid. 23.
[k] Ibid. 17.
[l] Ibid. 24. Cf. Cicero, Ad Attic. viii. 1—5. 8: 12.
[m] De Bello Civ. i. 18, 19, 20.

did receive letters from him on that day[n], announcing the arrival of Cæsar before Corfinium; which no doubt he answered the same day: and this answer of his would reach Domitius on February 19, just as Domitius' letters had reached him on February 16. And thus every thing will be consistent.

It must therefore be evident that the date of the xiii Kalendas Martias (Feb. 16 Roman) which occurs repeatedly in reference to these communications cannot be in error; and consequently that there can be no just foundation for the correction of it in the first instance of all[o], proposed by Pontedera and approved of apparently by Ernesti. It is a singular coincidence too that a letter is extant from Pompey[p] to L. Domitius, in answer to one of his received xiv Kalendas Martias February 15, (and therefore we may presume despatched on February 12 or 13,) in which there is no mention of Cæsar's actual arrival at Corfinium; though that it was expected, and that Domitius was prepared Observare Cæsarem, does appear from it. Nor had he in fact yet appeared before Corfinium on February 12 or 13 Roman.

But there is also a postscript to this letter from which it may be collected that the reply of Pompey to this communication of February 12 or 13 had only just been dictated, when Domitius' second despatches, announcing the actual arrival of Cæsar at Corfinium and urging Pompey to come to his assistance, must have been received. His litteris scriptis Sica a te mihi litteras adtulit et mandata. quod me hortare ut isthuc veniam; id me facere non arbitror posse: quod non magnopere his legionibus confido[q]. Another letter to Domitius follows, which was the proper answer to his second communication. Pompey therefore heard from him on successive days, February 15 and 16 Roman, December 27 and 28; and answered both letters the same day February 16 Roman December 28. Nor is there any difficulty in supposing that he might be at Luceria on the 16th of February, yet at Brundisium on the 24th, eight days after; though the distance from the former to the latter was nearly 150 Roman miles direct, nearly 170 by road. It appears from Cicero[r]

[n] Ad Atticum, viii. 12. Cf. 6. 11. [o] Ibid. 6. [p] Ibid. 12.
[q] Ad Attic. viii. 12. [r] Ibid. 9. 703 ad fin.

that he travelled himself Expeditus; leaving his legions to follow more leisurely. He was leaving Canusium on the morning of February 20; and he was then five days' journey from Brundisium[s].

iv. *On the Roman date of the Vernal Equinox, U. C. 705 B. C. 49, as it may be collected from the testimony of Cicero.*

There is still another date, which belongs to this year, and is the most important as yet considered; not indeed for the illustration and verification of our calendar for this particular year, (which now stands in no need of any further confirmation,) but in order to a just and exact idea of the nature, the details, and the effect of the Julian correction, three years after the present time. It is the Roman date of the vernal equinox, U. C. 705: and it is supplied by Cicero's account of his own proceedings before he crossed the sea to join Pompey in Epirus. We shall endeavour to fix it with all possible precision; and we shall therefore begin with collecting the allusions to that topic which occur in his epistles, and in their proper order of time.

i. De tota mea cogitatione scripsi ad te antea satis ut mihi visus sum diligenter*. de die nihil sane potest scribi certi, nisi quod non ante lunam novam[t]. This letter is dated XV Kalendas Maii February 24 B. C. 49. The moon was new February 13. By the new moon therefore here alluded to an earlier moon could not have been meant than that of March, March 14.

ii. Me adhuc nihil præter tempestatem moratur. astute nihil sum acturus, fiat in Hispania quidlibet[u]. There is no date to this letter; only, (we may presume,) it must have been later than the preceding one. It concludes: Pompeium pro certo habemus per Illyricum proficisci in Galliam. ego nunc qua et quo videbo†.

* Cf. Ad Attic. viii. 16: of the date of iv Nonas (Martias, see viii. 15); and even there he writes: Omnia mihi provisa sunt, præter occultum et tutum iter ad mare superum. hoc enim mari uti non possumus hoc tempore anni.

† Cf. also Ad Fam. iv. 2, dated iii Kal. Maii; which seems to have been written now, or after the arrival of Servius, by and by alluded to.

[s] Procopius, De Bello Goth. iii. 18. 352. 17. [t] Ad Attic. x. 5. [u] Ibid. 6.

iii. Tibi sunt omnia commendata quæ commendationis meæ pro tuo in nos amore non indigent. nec hercule ego quidem reperio quid scribam. sedeo enim πλευδοκῶν[w]. This letter was written vi Nonas (Maii) March 10: and Cicero was then expecting a visit from Antony, a letter from whom he subjoins. Antony had been left by Cæsar, when he went into Spain, in charge of Rome and Italy; and it would appear that he had begun to suspect Cicero's intentions, and was now taking precautions to prevent their execution. The same day[w] too he announces the receipt of a letter from Cæsar, dated xv Kalendas Maii in itinere, February 24; of the same date as his own to Atticus[t]. Cæsar was then on his way to Spain.

iv. In the next letter[x] he tells Atticus that he was expecting the arrival of Servius (Sulpicius Rufus[y], consul U.C. 703 B. C. 51, author of the beautiful epistle to Cicero, still extant[z], in which he consoles him for the loss of his daughter Tullia, B. C. 45, and the same who died in the course of the embassy to Antony, before the battle of Mutina[a], B. C. 43); Servium expecto ad Nonas (March 15): on which day he actually did come[b]; and the next day (March 16) had an interview with Cicero. This letter therefore was not written on the Nones, but on some day before it; probably on the vi Nonas (March 10): for the next letter[c] is dated on the v Nonas (March 11); and Cicero was then still expecting Antony: Erat enim v Nonas venturus vesperi; id est hodie. cras igitur ad me fortasse veniet.

v. Sed Antonius venit heri vesperi. jam fortasse ad me veniet: aut ne id quidem, quoniam scripsit quid fieri vellet[d]. sed scies continuo quid actum sit. nos jam nihil nisi occulte. de pueris quid agam? parvone navigio committam? quid mihi animi in navigando censes fore? recordor enim æstate, cum illo Rhodiorum ἀφράκτῳ navigans, quam fuerim sollicitus. quid duro tempore anni actuariolo censes fore[e]? The context fixes this letter to the iv Nonas (March 12).

vi. Nominatim de me sibi imperatum dicit Antonius. nec me tamen ipse adhuc viderat . . . . quid agam nunc? . . . un-

[w] Ad Attic. x. 8. [x] Ibid. 9. [a] Philippica, ix. 7, 15—17.
[y] Cf. Ad Fam. iv. 1, 2. [b] Ad Attic. x. 14. [c] Ibid. 10.
[z] Ad Fam. iv. 5. [d] Cf. Ibid. 8. [e] Ibid. 11.

dique custodior. sed satis lacrymis. πάρωρα πλευτέον igitur, et occulte in aliquam onerariam conrependum . . . sed mirificæ sunt custodiæ . . . quare vi aut clam agendum est, et si vi forte et cum tempestate[f]. There is no date to this letter; but we should think it was written iii Nonas (March 13).

vii. Servius pridie Nonas Maii Minturnis mansisse dicitur. hodie in Liternino mansurus . . . cras igitur nos mature videbit, mihique dabit argumentum ad te epistolæ . . . illud admiror quod Antonius ad me ne nuntium quidem[g]. There is no date to this too; but the context fixes it to the Nones (March 15).

viii. Servius ut antea scripsi cum venisset Nonis (Mar. 15) postridie (viii Idus, March 16) ad me venit: distulimus omnino sermonem in posterum[h] (vii Idus March 17). And this letter was probably written on the vii Idus.

ix. Servius cum esset apud me Cephalio cum tuis litteris vi Idus (March 18) venit ... eodem die Funisulanus a te attulit litteras...Antonius autem vi Idus Capuam profectus est. ad me misit se pudore deterritum ad me non venisse quod me sibi succensere putaret. ibitur igitur et ita quidem ut censes...ego dum panes et cetera in navem parantur excurro in Pompeianum[i]. This letter was probably written on the v Idus (March 19).

x. Consilium nostrum spero vacuum periculo fore...navigatio modo sit qualem opto...ego, ut minuerem suspicionem profectionis aut cogitationis meæ, profectus sum in Pompeianum a. d. iiii Idus (March 20), ut ibi essem dum quæ ad navigandum opus essent pararentur. cum ad villam venissem ventum est ad me. centuriones trium cohortium quæ Pompeiis sunt me velle postridie (iii Idus March 21)...at ego tibi postridie (March 21) a villa ante lucem. (There was no moon March 21 in the morning.) cogitavi eadem illa Cœliana quæ legi in epistola tua quam accepi simul et (*leg.* ac) in Cumanum veni eodem die[k] (iii Idus March 21).

Here we may compare one of the letters ad Familiares[l], to M. Marius; which refers to this same date and same occasion: Nam a. d. iii Idus Maias Lentulo et Marcello consulibus (U. C. 705) cum in Pompeianum vesperi venissem tu mihi

[f] Ad Attic. x. 12. [g] Ibid. 13, 14. [i] Ibid. 15. [k] Ibid. 16.
[h] Ibid. 14. [l] vii 3.

sollicito animo præsto fuisti. If however the iii Idus in this letter is not to be corrected by the iiii Idus (which we think is most probably the correction required) *in Pompeianum* must by a lapse of memory have been put for *in Cumanum*. It took a day to go *in Pompeianum*; and it would take a day to return *in Cumanum*. If he was at the former on the iv Idus in the evening he would be at the latter on the iii Idus in the evening: as he was when he wrote to Atticus[k]. He continues in this letter to Atticus[k]: Sed cum redeo Hortensius venerat, et ad Terentiam salutatum diverterat (probably at Formiæ[m]): misit enim puerum se ad me venire. But as it was now the evening of iii Idus (March 21) this visit could not have been intended of that day; at the earliest only of the next.

xi. Pridie Idus (March 22) Hortensius ad me venit, scripta epistola: which implies that the preceding letter was written Pridie Idus, March 22. deinde Serapion cum epistola tua...et hercule hominem bonum et doctum et probum existimo, quin etiam navi ejus me et ipso convectore usurum puto...nunc quidem æquinoctium nos moratur, quod valde perturbatum erat. id si ἀκραὲς erit utinam idem maneat Hortensius: siquidem ut adhuc erat liberalius esse nihil potest[n].

This letter is dated on the xvii Kalendas Junias, May 16 Roman, March 24 Julian; the day after the Idus. There is consequently no letter extant which was written on the Idus. But there is one the day before[o], and there is one the day after[n]. There is no mention of the equinox in the former; and there is in the latter: but even there it is spoken of as *past**: Valde *perturbatum erat*. There can be no doubt then that it had borne date on the Idus, May 15 Roman, March 23 Julian.

Now this is a very important conclusion. The date of the true vernal equinox, for the meridian of Rome, calculated from our own Tables, for this year A. M. 3956 B. C. 49,

* Nor is that inconsistent with the language applied to the day after the equinox, Id si ἀκραὲς erit (x. 17): the signification, ἐπισημασία, or influence attached to the ingress, was supposed to extend to the next day and to the next but one also.

[k] Loc. cit. Fam. viii. 17.
[m] Cf. Ad Attic. vii. 17. 18. Ad
[n] Ad Attic. x. 17. [o] Ibid. x. 16.

(U. C. 705), is found to have fallen March 23 at 4 h. 9 m. 49·8 sec. mean time from midnight; and not more than one hour and 19 or 20 minutes later, if we take into account the difference of our own Tables and of those of Delambre[p]. It may be taken for granted that the true date of the true vernal equinox B. C. 49, for any meridian in Italy, and according to any calculation which could be instituted at present, was this day; the Ides of Maius U. C. 705, March 23 B. C. 49: to which Cicero himself is thus seen to have fixed it the same year.

Now this as we have already observed is a very important fact. It has been generally assumed by modern chronologers that, only four years after this time, the cardinal points of the natural year were defined and laid down, in the process of the Julian correction, two days in excess of the truth; and of course not knowingly nor intentionally, but ignorantly and inadvertently. The first of these points for instance, the vernal equinox, B. C. 45, (which could not possibly have differed at that time except very slightly from the same date B. C. 49,) it has been commonly taken for granted was fixed and defined to March 25, instead of March 23. The testimony which we have just been considering is or ought to be demonstrative that the true date of this natural phenomenon, B. C. 49, was as well known to Cicero at the time, (within certain limits at least,) as to any modern astronomer at present; and if it was known to Cicero, what reason would there be to suppose that it was not just as well known to his contemporaries? to the educated at least, and to the learned, among his contemporaries? Could it be known to Cicero, and not known to Atticus? or to Varro, or to Tarutius, or to Nigidius Figulus? Could it be well known to Cicero and not known to Julius Cæsar, who was quite as good an astronomer as Cicero, if not a better? Or could it be known to either of *them*, and unknown to Sosigenes, an astronomer by profession, and probably the most eminent one of his day? To this subject however we must necessarily have occasion to return hereafter: and therefore we shall not dwell upon it any longer at present.

The next letter to Atticus[q] closes Cicero's correspondence

[p] Cf. the Fasti Catholici, iv. 503 sqq. Appendix.

[q] x. 18.

with *him*, (the extant correspondence at least,) for the present consular year; and it is dated on or after the xiv Kalendas Junias, March 27. After announcing the birth of a child of Tullia's on that day, it continues: Me mirificæ tranquillitates adhuc tenuerunt, atque majori impedimento fuerunt quam custodiæ quibus adservor. nam illa Hortensiana omnia fuere infantia. ita fiet homo nequissimus. For the actual date of his departure at last, we must go to the letters Ad Familiares[r], and in particular to those to Terentia. There is one of these which is dated iv Nonas Junias[s] April 10 (B.C. 49); and in our opinion was written at this time. It contains the first allusion to some illness of her's, which was continuing when he wrote to her again on the iii Idus Junias, (April 19) as follows[t]: Navem spero nos valde bonam habere: in eam simul atque conscendi hæc scripsi: deinde conscribam ad nostros familiares multas epistolas quibus te et Tulliolam nostram diligentissime commendabo. April 19 B. C. 49 was the seventh luna: so that, howsoever long he had been prevented from executing his original intention as made known to Atticus[u] February 24 before, he was not setting out at last *Ante lunam novam*.

v. *On the date of the reduction of Spain by Cæsar*, B. C. 49.

There is much more on record, relating to the general history of this year, which would illustrate and confirm our calendar were it to be considered in detail. We shall however notice only one additional proof of this kind (and that too very briefly); taken from the history of the campaign of the year in Spain.

Of the fragments of the Julian calendar, which are more or less entire for particular months, there are four, the Maffæan, the Capranic, the Amiternine, and the Antiatine, which concur in dating the reduction of Spain upon this occasion on the iv Nonas (Augustas or) Sextiles, June 9 B. C. 49: though, as they also imply, by Spain in this instance we are to understand Hispania Citerior, not Ulterior: Hispania Ulterior was reduced afterwards[y].

[r] xiv. 7. Cf. vi. 6: viii. 17. Ad Attic. x. 18. Ad Fam. xi. 27.
[s] xiv. 8.
[t] xiv. 7.
[u] x. 5.
[y] Cf. Florus, iv. 2, 29. Cæsar, De Bello Civ. ii. 17. 18 sqq.

Now we have the testimony of Curio, one of the legates of Cæsar, that this reduction was completed in *forty* days[w] after Cæsar had come into the presence of the enemy; i. e. of Afranius and Petreius, who were commanding at this time in Spain for Pompey: as he did first at Ilerda on the Sicoris[x]. If so, these proceedings at Ilerda, between Cæsar in person, and Afranius and Petreius, began May 1 B. C. 49; and assuming this datum we should not have much trouble in digesting the train of events subsequently[y]: and in particular, in making out a succession of *twelve* days[z] from the morning of May 28 at least, (which the context determines to the day after the full of the moon, May 27,) down to June 9[a] (the day of the submission of Afranius and Petreius,) which would greatly confirm our calendar, and attest the authenticity of the traditionary date of the submission, Sextilis 2 June 9*.

We will observe only that within two days after the arrival of Cæsar on the spot, (May 1 and 2,) there was a sudden setting in of bad weather[b]; which would thus coincide with the 19th or 20th luna: Accidit etiam repentinum incommodum biduo quo hæc gesta sunt. tanta enim tempestas cooritur ut nunquam illis locis majores aquas fuisse constaret. tum autem ex omnibus montibus nivis proluit, ac summas ripas fluminis superavit, pontesque ambo quos C. Fabius fecerat[c] uno die interrupit[d]. Lucan considered this incident of sufficient importance to deserve to be particularly introduced into his

* The interval from May 2–28 is passed over in a great measure without details. A story is related by Seneca (iv. 242 De Beneficiis, iv. xxiv. 1–3) of something which happened to Cæsar at Sucro in Spain. Sucro was a place or a river in Hispania Citerior (Tarraconensis). It does not appear that in the course of these operations against Petreius and Afranius Cæsar could have been taken as far south of Ilerda as the river Sucro; but he would have to cross that river, returning from Corduba or Gades in Hispania Ulterior to Tarraço (De Bello Civ. ii. 21): and the incident in question alluded to by Seneca might happen in the course of that journey.

w De Bello Civ. ii. 32.
x Ibid. i. 38. 40–87. Cf. Livy, cx. Dio, xli. 20–23. App. B. C. ii. 42. 43. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxvi. Pompeius, lxv. Orosius, vi. 15.
y De Bello Civ. i. 41–87.
z Ibid. 59. 64. Cf. Frontinus, i. viii. 9.
a De Bello Civ. i. 87. Cf. Suetonius, Julius, lxxv. 4.
b De Bello Civ. i. 40: 41–47. Cf. Florus, iv. 2, 27.
c De Bello Civ. i. 40.
d Ibid. 48. Cf. Dio, xli. 20.

Pharsalia; only he has antedated it there, and placed it in March, about the equinox; instead of at the beginning of May.

Directly after Cæsar observes[e], Tempus erat anni difficillimum, quo neque frumenta in hibernis erant neque multum a maturitate aberant; which implies that for the climate of Spain the corn was approaching to maturity soon after May 2. We have it in our power to illustrate that fact by the testimony of two letters of Asinius Pollio, written to Cicero[f] B. C. 43 from Corduba in Spain. The first of them is dated xvii Kalendas Apriles; but the comparison of it with the second will shew that it must have been written in reality on the day of the battle of Mutina[g], the xvii Kal. Maias: or at least that the ship which carried it left the port of Gades on that day. And the next letter, as we may collect from the end of it, was *forty* days later. Yet in this the writer observes: Anni autem tempus libertatem mihi majorem dat propterea quia frumenta aut in agris aut in villis sunt[h]. The xvii Kal. Maias at this time answered to April 13; and forty days later would be May 23: by which time, according to this testimony of Asinius Pollio, the harvest in some parts of the country was already over. Pliny tells us that the barley was ripe at New Carthage in Spain even in the month of April[i].

vi. *On the dates of the Rescripts*, B. C. 49, *which occur in Josephus.*

We shall conclude the consideration of this year with an illustration or two of a different kind from any which we have yet produced.

Three edicts are extant in Josephus[k], passed by one of the consuls of the year, Lucius Lentulus, at Ephesus; (in favour at least of the Jews of Ephesus;) in which he absolved them from the obligation of serving in war: Πρὸ τοῦ βήματος, Pro tribunali, publicly and judicially, δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα: i. e. because of their scruples about the sabbath; which, if they had been compelled to serve as soldiers, they must have been

[e] De Bello Civ. i. 48. Cf. iii. 47: also Suetonius, Julius Cæsar, xxxiv. 2: 3.

[f] Ad Fam. x. 31: 33.

[g] Ad. Fam. x. 30. Cf. Ovid, Fasti, iv. 625, who dates Mutina xviii Kal. Maias.

[h] Ad Fam. x. 33.

[i] H. N. xviii. 18. p. 77, 78.

[k] Ant. Jud. xiv. x. 13: 16: 18.

constantly liable to break by marching or doing some other military duty on that day.

In the third of these edicts[l] Lentulus is styled Proconsul; which would imply that it was passed the next year, U. C. 706 B. C. 48: and, as its Roman date would prove, after the battle of Pharsalia itself. But there can be no doubt that *ἀνθύπατος* in this instance is a corrupt reading for *ὕπατος*; and that all these decrees belong to *one* year, the year before not after Pharsalia: when both the consuls and all in authority were actively employed in raising forces in all parts of the empire, distinct from Italy and Spain, against the decisive struggle. which was expected the next year.

One of these edicts is dated Πρὸ δεκαδύο Καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων[m]; the other two Πρὸ δεκατριῶν Καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων[o]: but as they were all to the same effect, and in favour of the same parties, we cannot but think that they were passed on the same occasion, Πρὸ ιγ′ not Πρὸ ιβ′ Καλανδῶν Ὀκτωβρίων. And this is not an unimportant distinction. For the xiii Kal. Oct. U. C. 705 was July 24 B. C. 49; the xii Kal. Oct. was July 25: and the Dom. Lett. of the year being E D July 24 was *Friday*, July 25 was *Saturday;* on which day it must have been contrary to the scruples of the Jews to appear before the tribunal of the consul, even to receive this dispensation itself.

There is another edict of this same consul[p], issued at Ephesus also, but in Quinctilis, before any of the preceding three; though on what day in Quinctilis is not specified. The limits of this month U. C. 705 were May 8—June 8 B. C. 49; and if the first of the month is meant (as is most probable) that too was a Friday, May 8. There is also in this part of Josephus[q] a Delian decree: Ψήφισμα Δηλίων· Ἐπὶ Ἄρχοντος Βοιωτοῦ μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος εἰκοστῇ, χρηματισμὸς στρατηγῶν: wherein Marcus Piso, the legate of Lentulus at Delos, accorded the same immunity to the Jews of Delos, freemen of Rome, as Cornelius Lentulus the consul had done to those of Asia. We know not indeed the date of the archonship of Bœotus. But the calendar of Delos at this time was the Attic; and by the Attic, Period vi. 3, the first of

[l] Ant. Jud. xiv. x. 18. [m] Ibid. 15. [o] Ibid. 16: 18. [p] Ibid. 19. [q] Ibid. 14.

Thargelion fell on May 20, B. C. 49: and the 20th on June 8, *on* the first of the Roman Sextilis U. C. 705. Nor can there be any doubt that Lentulus' decree, passed at Ephesus May 8, might already be known of in Delos by June 8. June 8 too that year was the Feria secunda or Monday.

SECTION IV.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 17. 354 *days.*

U. C. 706 Varr. 705 Cap. 703 Polyb. B. C. 49–48.

C. Julius Cæsar ii
P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Nov. 2 B. C. 49. Nundinal Char. 2.

The ingress of this consular year, the second year of the civil war, is thus described by Lucan[r].

Sic alterna duces bellorum vulnera passos
In Macetum terras miscens adversa secundis
Servavit fortuna pares. jam sparserat Hæmo
Bruma nives gelidoque cadens Atlantis Olympo.
Instabatque dies qui dat nova nomina Fastis
Quique colit primus ducentem tempora Janum.

That is, as the Scholiast observes, Mense Novembri atque Decembri dicto, quando Vergiliæ occidunt. From this description then of the circumstances of the ingress in the present instance it must be inferred that Lucan had a correct idea of the relation of the civil year to the natural at this juncture of time; for the Kalends of January were now actually falling on November 2. Still that he meant by this description rather the close of the preceding consular year, than the beginning of the next to it, appears not only from his language here[s], but also from subsequent allusions; which shew that even after this point of time the consuls of the year before were supposed by him to be still in office[t], and Cæsar to be still absent from Rome[u], and his appointment to the dictatorship to be an event yet future[w].

The date of the Πλειάδων δύσις, Vergiliarum occasus, late

[r] Pharsalia, v. 1. [s] Ibid. 5, 6. [t] Ibid. 8–47. [u] Ibid. 237. [w] Ibid. 381–384: 391, 392.

or cosmical setting of the Pleiads, the beginning of the Brumal quarter of the natural year according to the ancients, was very differently represented in the Parapegmata of antiquity; and might vary from October 20 to November 14.[x] In the calendar of Cæsar its stated date was the iii Idus Novembres, November 11 of his time, November 9 Julian; and this is that date of the phenomenon which Lucan was most likely to mean. We cannot however insist on the strict historical exactness of such allusions as these in a poetical writer. It is sufficient to illustrate their propriety, if they can be shewn to have accorded to the state of the calendar of the same time *generally;* and that was clearly the case in the second year of the war of Pharsalia, when the beginning of the civil year, the setting of the Pleiads, and the ingress of the Brumal quarter, were so nearly coincident.

i. *On the date of the first Dictatorship of Julius Cæsar.*

With regard to the actual course of events this year; Cæsar was created Dictator Extra ordinem while he was yet in Spain[y], or at Massilia on his way returning to Rome from Spain[z]: and the news of this appointment reached him at Marseilles, when he was there on the road homewards.

The learned archbishop Usher assumed the date of this creation to have been September 24 B. C. 49, without assigning any justification of that assumption from testimony. It is not sufficient to justify it that the Æra of the Autonomia at Antioch bore date U. C. 705 B. C. 49. It did not bear date from this day, September 24, in that year. The epoch of the Æra of Antioch, like that of the Æra Seleucidarum which it superseded at Antioch, from the time when it came into being, to the best of our judgment and belief, was always the first of the Macedonian month Hyperberetæus; the luuar Hyperberetæus as long as the calendar of Antioch was lunar, the solar as soon as it became solar. At this present time its calendar was still lunar; and that form of the Hellenic Lunar calendar to which we have given the name of the Macedo-Syrian[a]. In this calendar, Period iv. 29, the first of

[x] Cf. our Prolegomena, p. 2; 7.
[y] De Bello Civ. ii. 21. Cf. iii. 1.
[z] Cf. Dio, xli. 36. Appian, B. C. ii. 48. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxvii.
[a] Fasti Catholici, i. 598—607.

Hyperberetæus bore date September 9 B. C. 49. It is a possible contingency that *this* was the actual day of Cæsar's appointment to the Dictatorship, U. C. 705, and ultimately the reason why even the Æra of Antioch, instead of bearing date from the actual year of the Αὐτονομία, U. C. 707 B. C. 47, (or U. C. 706 ex auctumno B. C. 48,) was purposely made to bear date from U. C. 705 B. C. 49; because Cæsar had been created Dictator in that year, and possibly on that very day. In the Roman calendar of the time being September 9 coincided with the Nones of November; and though Pridie Nonas Novembres U. C. 705 September 8 B. C. 49 was Nundinal, the Nones, September 9, were not Nundinal.

This assumption then may be considered probable, though it cannot be regarded as certain; viz. that the date of Cæsar's first dictatorship was September 9 B. 49. It has also been supposed that after he entered upon it at Rome he held it only eleven days[b]; and then abdicated: but though that might perhaps have been the case, yet it could not be necessarily inferred from his own testimony[c]: Dictatore habente comitia Cæsare consules creantur Julius Cæsar et P. Servilius—His rebus et feriis Latinis[d] comitiisque omnibus perficiendis undecim dies tribuit; Dictaturaque se abdicat; et ab urbe proficiscitur Brundisiumque pervenit[e]. That he did not hold the dictatorship less than eleven days clearly appears from these words; that he did not hold it more is not necessarily to be collected from them: and, though Plutarch and Appian have drawn that inference from them, Dio[f] has not done the same; and he generally notices such particular circumstances in the history of an extraordinary office, when he was aware of them.

ii. *On the date of the passage of Cæsar from Brundisium to Epirus*, B. C. 49.

The date of the actual departure of Cæsar from Rome to Brundisium, and the date of his actual arrival there, have not been handed down. All that we know for certain is that he put to sea from Brundisium at last Pridie Nonas Janu-

[b] Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxvii. Appian, B. C. ii. 48. Zonaras, x. 8. 484 B.
[c] De Bello Civ. iii. 1.
[d] Cf. Lucan, Phars. v. 400–402.
[e] De Bello Civ. iii. 2. Dio, xli. 39. 43.
[f] xli. 36.

arias U. C. 706, November 5. B. C. 49; and landed at Oricum, on the opposite coast, the next day, the Nones of January, November 6[g].

Here then it is worth while to observe in what manner the ambiguity of the Roman date of the passage, Pridie Nonas Januarias, combined with an ignorance of the real state of the calendar, and of the actual relation of the civil to the natural year, at the time, misled the ancients in their judgment of these proceedings of Cæsar; and made them either give him credit for more boldness, or censure him for more temerity, than the nature of the case required. Χειμῶνος *ἐν τροπαῖς ὄντος*, says Plutarch[h], *ἰσταμένου Ἰανουαρίου μηνός· οὗτος δ' ἂν εἴη Ποσειδεὼν Ἀθηναίοις· ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος* —And again[i]: *Καὶ πάλιν ὑπερβαλὼν τὰς Ἄλπεις καὶ διαδραμὼν τὴν Ἰταλίαν εἰς Βρεντέσιον ἦκεν, ἐν τροπαῖς ἤδη τοῦ χειμῶνος ὄντος, καὶ διαπεράσας τὸ πέλαγος αὐτὸς μὲν εἰς Ὠρικὸν παρενέβαλεν.* And that he knew the Roman date of the passage appears from the Moralia[k]: *Πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας νοννῶν Ἰανουαρίων, χειμῶνος ἐν τροπαῖς ὄντος.* In like manner Appian[l]: *Καὶ τάδε πράξας περὶ χειμερίους τροπὰς περιέπεμπε τὸν στρατὸν ἅπαντᾶν εἰς Βρεντέσιον· αὐτός τε ἐξῄει Δεκεμβρίου μηνὸς Ῥωμαίοις ὄντος, οὐκ ἀναμείνας οὐδὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕνεκα τὴν νουμηνίαν τοῦ ἔτους πλησιάζουσαν.* And again[m]: Ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ *ὡς μοι προείρητο περὶ χειμερίους τροπὰς εἰς Βρεντέσιον ἠπείγετο.* And when he was now there and ready to put to sea, he observes[n]: Χειμέριοι (δ') *ἦσαν τροπαί, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἄκουτα καὶ ἀσχάλλοντα κατεκώλυε μέχρι καὶ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέραν ἐν Βρεντεσίῳ κατατρῖψαι.* Nor was the historian Dio free from the same misapprehension; since he too supposes the passage from Brundisium at last to have been made Μεσοῦντος *τοῦ χειμῶνος*[o].

It may be collected from Dio[p] that Cæsar set out from Rome to Brundisium, Ἐπ' *ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ἔτους*: and it is plainly asserted by Appian that he did so in the Roman December, and was already come to Brundisium before the Kalends of January. It is not improbable therefore that the actual date

[g] De Bello Civ. iii. 6.
[h] Cæsar, xxxvii.
[i] Pompeius, lxv.
[k] De Fortuna Romanorum, vi.
[l] Bell. Civ. ii. 48.
[m] Ibid. 52. Cf. 53.
[n] Ibid. 54. Cf. 150: also Illyrica, 12.
[o] xli. 44. Cf. xliv. 44. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. lviii. 4. Florus, iv. 2, 36.
[p] Ibid. 39. Cf. 44.

of his departure from Rome was the nominal date of the winter solstice in the Roman calendar, the viii Kal. Januarias, December 25 Roman of aftertime; and that this was the reason of the particular allusion to that season of the year which occurs in the preceding accounts: though the actual Julian date of viii Kal. Januarias at this time was only October 26. Brundisium indeed was 360 Roman miles distant from Rome: but there are instances on record of that distance having been travelled in five days' time[q]; and Lucan supposes it only a ten days' march for an army:

Brundisium decimis jubet hanc attingere castris[r]:

though that would be at the rate of 36 miles a day. No general of antiquity ever travelled more expeditiously than Cæsar; nor can there be any doubt that, though he had left Rome only on the viii Kal. Januarias, he would be already at Brundisium on the Kalends of January, as Appian supposes him to have been.

And hence we may form some idea of the time of his appointment to the dictatorship, and of his return to Rome from Spain. For if he set out at last on October 26, he must have abdicated the dictatorship on October 25: and if he held it eleven days at least previously he could not have entered upon it later than October 15 *. Consequently neither could he have arrived from Spain later than October 14; and between September 9 and October 14 the interval would be only 35 days: and that might not be more than

* It is worthy of remark that Lucan observes of the Feriæ Latinæ this year, Pharsalia, v. 400.

Necnon Iliacæ numen quod præsidet Albæ,
Haud meritum Latio sollemnia sacra subacto,
Vidit flammifera confectas nocte Latinas.

We may infer from these words that there was something different from usual in the ceremony of these Feriæ that year. And that seems to have been *this*, that they were celebrated at night on this occasion. If so, most probably on a moonlight night. Now the moon being new October 7 would be at the full October 21 or 22; about the middle of the eleven days for which Cæsar held the dictatorship, if he entered upon it October 15, and abdicated it October 25.

[q] Cf. our Dissertations, on the Principles, &c. iii. 385 note.

[r] Pharsalia, v. 374. Cf. Pliny H. N. ii. 112. 484.

necessary both to carry the news of his election to the dictatorship to Marseilles, and for his own journey from thence to Rome. For both these purposes, and by land, a month would probably be required; though by sea the voyage from Rome to Massilia might have been performed in five or six days[s].

That the weather was unsettled when Cæsar arrived at Brundisium might also be inferred from Lucan[t]:

> Curvique tenens Minoïa tecta
> Brundisii clausas ventis brumalibus undas
> Invenit, et pavidas hiberno sidere classes.

And independently of the season of the year the moon was new October 7 B. C. 49, and Nov. 5, the actual date of the passage, too: and that being the case, it is extraordinary that Lucan should be found speaking of the moon as shining at the very time of the passage; which he supposes to have begun at sunset:

> Sidera prima poli Phœbo labente sub undas
> Exierant, et luna suas jam fecerat umbras,
> Cum pariter solvere rates[u].

This description would apply only to the moon at the full, and rising at sunset. There is no allusion to the moon, in Cæsar's own account of the passage. He tells us merely that he put to sea Pridie Nonas Januarias, (Nov. 5,) and landed on the opposite side Postridie[w], (Nov. 6); and that he sent his ships back again the same night: which however as Serius a terra provectæ neque usæ nocturna aura in redeundo offenderunt[x]. It might be inferred from this account that he set out at night (and probably he did so); consequently that he had the benefit of moonlight. And in this way perhaps the mistake of Lucan may be explained.

iii. *On the chronology of the proceedings in Epirus, before the retreat of Cæsar from Dyrrhachium.*

It would consequently be from this date of the Nones of January U. C. 706 November 6 B. C. 49 that we should have to trace the chronology of subsequent proceedings between Cæsar and Pompey, down to the battle of Pharsalia; were it necessary for our particular purpose to do this in detail.

[s] Cf. Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 57. 48.
[t] Pharsalia, v. 406–408. Cf. 413—423.
[u] Ibid. 424.
[w] De Bello Civ. iii. 6.
[x] Ibid. 8.

But it would take up too much time; and for the object which only we have in view, the verification of our Roman calendar, it is not necessary.

We will however observe that the most indispensable preliminary to such a consideration would be the determination of the point of time from which Suetonius dates the circumvallation of Pompey at Dyrrhachium: Hinc urbe repetita in Macedoniam transgressus Pompeium per quatuor pæne menses maximis obsessum operibus * ad extremum Pharsalico prælio fudit [y]. The beginning of this circumvallation was the arrival of Cæsar and Pompey at Dyrrhachium [z]; which is fixed by the context to the day after the departure of Cæsar from Asparagium: and, as he is represented to have marched (followed by Pompey) not only for the whole of that day but also for the following night, we may reasonably infer from these facts that he must have arrived at Dyrrhachium about the full of some moon, when the nights were light throughout.

If then we may assume at present that the siege was broken up at last and Cæsar's march into Thessaly was begun [a] on or about May 2, Suetonius' *four* months must have come to an end at the beginning of May; and therefore, unless they were meant of *four* months complete, they must have begun about the middle of January. The moon was actually at the full on or about January 18 B. C. 48. How then will this date of the arrival at Dyrrhachium consist with the testimony of Cæsar himself [b]?

Multi jam menses transierant et hiems jam præcipitaverat, neque Brundisio naves legionesque ad Cæsarem veniebant; ac nonnullæ ejus rei prætermissæ occasiones Cæsari videbantur, quod certe sæpe flaverant venti quibus necessario

* It is singular that as the text of Appian stands at present the extent of these lines of Cæsar, before Dyrrhachium, is represented at 1200 stades, instead of 120, from sea to sea: though (B. C. iii. 43) he himself makes it only 15 stades; and Lucan (Phars. vi. 73–77) estimates it at the distance of Aricia or Ostia from Rome, or from Rome to the mouth of the Tyber, in a straight line: i. e. 16 miles. Cf. the Scholia.

[y] Julius Cæsar, xxxv. 1. Cf. lxviii. Cæsar, De Bello Civili, iii. 43–73. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxix. Pompeius, lxv. Dio, xli. 49: 50. Livy, cxi. Appian, B.C. ii. 61. Florus, iv. 2. § 39. Orosius, vi. 15.

[z] Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 41–43.

[a] Ibid. 67–72: 73.

[b] Ibid. 25. Cf. Dio, xli. 46–48.

committendum existimabat . . . . . quibus rebus permotus Cæsar Brundisium ad suos severius scripsit: nacti idoneum ventum ne occasionem navigandi omitterent.

This was of course before the actual junction of Antonius and Kalenus with the forces from Brundisium; and if Cæsar himself at this time had been two months on the opposite side of the sea he might speak of it in general terms even then as Multi jam menses. In the construction of the passage in question much depends on the classical sense of *Præcipitaverat*, applied to the winter; Et hiems jam præcipitaverat. Each of the seasons of the natural year was divided by the Romans into the *Novum*, the *Adultum*, and the *Præceps* of its kind; and the winter quarter being reckoned from the Vergiliarum occasus (iii Idus Novembres, November 11 in the Julian calendar) to the Flatus Favonii, (the vii Idus Februarias, in the Julian calendar also,) it consisted of *three* months, two before the solstice and one after it. The proper sense of the *hiems præceps* or *præcipitata* was to denote the *third* of these months[c]: as the *hiems adulta* would have meant the second, the *hiems nova* the first.

The time of the year then intimated in this allusion would properly be from the first week in January B. C. 48 to the first or second in February. It is observable that in the same passage it is said the wind had often been favourable for the transit from Brundisium to the coast of Epirus. The wind which would be required for that purpose was the south wind (Auster), or the south-west (Africus); and in the Parapegmata of antiquity[d] the south winds are noted as beginning to blow on the 12th day after the winter solstice itself; which at this period of the world would be on or about January 3 or 4. The account of the passage itself at last[e] shews that the south wind was actually blowing for two days (*Per biduum*) during which the ships of Cæsar were on the sea; and the south-west (Africus) just when they wanted to come to land.

[c] Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. iii. 644, 645. To the examples of this use of Præcipito, there adduced, add Cicero, Ad Fam. xi. 28: Ætate præcipitata: Oratio xxx. De Haruspicum Resp. 24, 50, Reliqua jam præcipitantis tribunatus: xxxii. Pro P. Sextio, 11, 25: Præcipitanti patriæ.

[d] Apud Geminum, Columellam, Ptolemæum, et alios.

[e] Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 26–28. Cf. Appian, B. C. ii. 56–59. Plutarch, Antonius, vii.

Cæsar may be assumed to have effected his junction with these reinforcements five or six days after he set out from his encampment on the Apsus to meet them[f]*: and that having been accomplished, we have next only *two* days more to the arrival at Asparagium where Pompey was posted[g]; and *two* days there, including the day of the arrival: and on the *next* day, the march of both Pompey and Cæsar to Dyrrhachium, where each arrived in the morning. So that, if we may suppose that all this was continuous, and that the date of this arrival at Dyrrhachium was January 19 (the day after the full moon), Cæsar must have come to Asparagium on January 16; and must have effected his junction with Antony January 14: and Antony with these reinforcements must have been making the passage a few days before January 9. And thus every thing will be consistent. Suetonius' four months, on this principle, must have borne date on or about January 19 B. C. 48 (x Kalendas Apriles U. C. 706); and had they been *four* complete they would have extended down to the x Kalendas Sextiles, May 19. But he himself speaks of them as only *quatuor pæne* menses; and their actual duration appears to have been from the x Kalendas Apriles January 19 to Pridie Nonas Quinctiles May 2; three months of Roman time by the calendar and half of a fourth †.

The epistles of Cicero are not of much use in assisting us to clear up the chronology of the early part of these proceedings; yet they confirm our conclusion respecting the actual date of this breaking up of the siege of Dyrrhachium: at least to a certain extent.

There is one letter to Atticus[h] of the date of Pridie Nonas

* Antony landed at Nymphæum, (iii. 26,) three miles Roman beyond Lissus. Soon after (29) he was admitted into Lissus. Cæsar must have marched to him there; and from the Apsus to Lissus the distance in a right line could not be less than 80 Roman miles = 90 by road at least. That would require six days at the rate of 15 miles a day, and five even at the rate of 20.

† That the entire interval in question was not less than three months may, we think, be inferred from Cicero Ad Fam. xiii. 29.

[f] De Bello Civ. iii. 30–34. Cf. 41. [g] Ibid. 41. Cf. 76. Appian, B. C. ii. 55. [h] xi. 2.

Februarii (Dec. 4 B. C. 49); consequently long before the beginning of the siege. There is another[i], dated Idibus Juniis ex castris, April 10 B. C. 48: and at that time Pompey had been besieged by Cæsar nearly three months. There is a third[k], in which Cicero complains of being unwell; and when *that* was written Pompey was no longer at Dyrrhachium. And though it is without a date, there is a letter to Terentia[l], which in other respects relates to the same subjects as that to Atticus; implying that both were written about the same time, the letter to Terentia first and then that to Atticus. And *this* letter to Terentia is dated Idibus Quinctilibus, May 11. Pompey therefore had left Dyrrhachium before May 11 at least.

During the whole of this four months' blockade of Dyrrhachium Lucan describes Cæsar as master indeed of the country but as suffering from the want of necessaries.

> At liber terræ spatiosis collibus hostis
> Aëre non pigro nec inertibus angitur undis:
> Sed patitur sævam veluti circumdatus arcta
> Obsidione famem; nondum surgentibus altam
> In segetem culmis[m].

And this in fact is merely Cæsar's own representation of the circumstances in which he was actually placed for the first part of the interval at least: Ipse autem consumtis omnibus longe lateque frumentis summis erat in augustiis: sed tamen hæc singulari patientia milites ferebant[n]. And yet, (as was naturally to be expected, the season going on advancing,) even these privations are spoken of as gradually becoming less and less: Jamque frumenta maturescere incipiebant, atque ipsa spes inopiam sustentabat[o]—At Cæsaris exercitus optima valetudine summaque aquæ copia utebatur: tum commeatus omni genere præter frumentum abundabat: quibus quotidie melius succedere tempus majoremque spem maturitate frumentorum proponi videbat[o].

[i] xi. 3.
[k] Ibid. 4.
[l] Ad Fam. xv. 6. Cf. Ad Attic. xi. 13.
[m] Phars. vi. 106.
[n] De Bello Civ. iii. 47.
[o] Ibid. 49.

iv. *On the chronology of the proceedings from the retreat from Dyrrhachium to the battle of Pharsalia.*

The retreat of Cæsar from before Dyrrhachium followed with little or no delay after Pompey's second attack upon his lines[p]; the success of which was the only material advantage which he gained in the course of the war.

We cannot undertake to pronounce with certainty upon the date of this retreat; but from the most careful consideration of the context of events both before and after it we are strongly of opinion that it must have taken place about the new moon of May, which this year fell on the 2nd of that month. On the first day of the retreat Cæsar encamped within his old lines at Asparagium on the river Genusus[q]. And on the fourth day after[r] he seems to have got so much in advance of Pompey that he pursued him no further at this time; but left him to march unmolested to Apollonia[r]. He was probably at Apollonia on or about May 6.

From Apollonia to Æginium on the borders of Thessaly, where Cæsar effected his junction with his legate Cn. Domitius Calvinus[s], the distance was little less than 150 Roman miles direct[t]=170 by road: and that would require eight or nine days' march at the rate even of 20 miles a day. Appian seems to represent the length of the march even from Dyrrhachium to Pharsalia as not more than *seven* days[u]; which is scarcely credible: though Cæsar was certainly making great marches at this time. We may assume then that he probably arrived at Æginium in seven or eight days from Apollonia: consequently on or about May 14.

Gomphi was 17 miles direct=19 by road, distant from this point; and as it was taken by storm, between the *ninth* hour of the day and *sunset*[w], we may conclude it must have

[p] Ibid. 62—72: cf. 51—53: Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxix. Pompeius, lxv. lxvi. Suetonius, Julius, xxxvi. 2. Dio, xli. 49—51. Appian, B. C. ii. 61—63. 64. Cicero, Ad Fam. vii. 3. Velleius Pat. ii. 51.

[q] iii. 73—76: cf. 30. 41. Appian, B. C. ii. 64: Dio, xli. 51, 52.

[r] iii. 76—78.

[s] Ibid. 79. Domitius was sent into these parts early in the year, soon after the arrival of Antony from Brundisium, if not before it: De Bello Civ. iii. 34—38: 31—33: cf. 80: Appian, B. C. ii. 60.

[t] Cf. Lucan, vi. 329.

[u] B. C. ii. 64. Ἑπτὰ συντόνως ἡμέρας.

[w] De Bello Civ. iii. 80. Plutarch, Cæsar, xli. Appian, B. C. ii. 64. Panegyrici Veteres, ix. vi. 1.

been on May 15. The next day (May 16) Cæsar moved to Metropolis[x]: and as that was 27 miles direct, 29 or 30 by road, distant from Pharsalia, it is probable that he did not arrive in that vicinity before May 18: but having so arrived, Segetis idoneum locum in agris nactus quæ prope jam matura erat * ibi adventum exspectare Pompeii . . . constituit[x].

* In these different allusions to the harvest, it does not appear whether wheat-harvest or barley-harvest was intended. But though the word employed to denote the grain which was growing at the time is *frumentum*, and that in its most general sense is as applicable to barley, (*hordeum*,) as to wheat, (*triticum*,) yet if there was any difference in the times of these two kinds of harvest respectively, the earlier of the two, that which would be the first to come in and was the nearest at hand, must have been first and properly meant.

According to Lucan, the corn was not yet ripe even when Pompey, as well as Cæsar, was now come into Thessaly.

> Ad præmaturas segetum jejuna rapinas
> Agmina compulimus, votumque effecimus hosti
> Ut mallet sterni gladiis [1].

And that might be the case even with barley-harvest as late as May 21 or 22; though Cæsar gives us to understand it was not far from maturity even when he arrived, which was some days before Pompey: and Lucan himself implies that grain was to be found in the fields, ripe for cutting, on the morning of Pharsalia itself [2].

> Illo forte die &c.

But there are other suppositions in his account of these proceedings which could not have been founded in fact. For example, the speech which he puts into the mouth of Cicero [3], just before the battle; as if he too was present at Pharsalia: though we know from his own letters [4] that he was left at Dyrrhachium sick, when Pompey marched thence; and from other parts of his works that he was still at Dyrrhachium when the news of the battle arrived there.

We may have occasion, on a future opportunity, to collect the testimonies of antiquity to the different dates of barley and of wheat-harvest respectively for different parts of Greece. There can be little question that in Attica barley would be ready for the sickle about the third week in May at this time; and wheat about the third week in June. It could hardly be later on the plains of Pharsalia, the warmest part of Thessaly: though probably wheat was more generally grown in that country than barley.

And here we may observe that, as the date of this memorable battle

1 vii. 98.
2 Ibid. 235. Cf. Appian, B. C. ii. 68. Polyænus, viii. 23. Cæsar, 14.
3 vii. 67.
4 Cf. Ad Attic. xi. 4. Ad Fam. vii. 3: ix. 18. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxix: Cato, lv. Livy, cxi. Dio, xlii. 10.

[x] D Bello Civ. iii. 81.

Pompey was already on his march to join Scipio[y]; who was

about the end of the eighteenth century was made the subject of a warm and active controversy among the learned; and as the question of the season of harvest for the climate of Thessaly was necessarily mixed up with it; the French consul at Salonica (the ancient Thessalonica) A. D. 1785 was requested by some of the members of the Academy to make inquiries about it upon the spot. He did so, and his answer, as we find it reported in the Dissertation of Mons. De la Nauze on the Roman calendar[5], was as follows:

"Suivant les informations que j'ai demandées en Thessalie, et suivant ce que m'en ont rapporté ici des gens de ce pays là la moisson s'y fait dans le mois de Juin: du côté de Larissa et de Tricala, c'est dès les premiers jours de Juin, et du côté de Jannina et des environs ce n'est que du 15 au 20 du même mois."

These dates being reduced to old style, it appears from them that for the neighbourhood of the ancient Larissa (that of the ancient Pharsalia too) the harvest (wheat-harvest no doubt) still began about the 20th or 21st of May: and as the summer solstice at this time was falling June 10 or 11 old style, this, it is manifest, was about 20 or 21 days before the solstice. At the time of Pharsalia, the summer solstice was falling on June 25: and the date of Pharsalia, the 5th of June, would bear exactly the same proportion to the solstitial date of this time as May 20 or 21 to the solstitial date of A. D. 1785. If wheat then was commonly ripe for the same locality A. D. 1785 about May 20 or 21; it would be ripe for the locality in question, B. C. 48, about June 5 or 6: at the very time when it appears from the testimony of Cæsar that it *actually* must have been. So invariable are the laws of nature; and so consistent with itself is truth even in the slightest circumstances.

Among the prodigies or omens, as they were considered, which preceded the battle, some merely natural phenomena are enumerated; as a storm of thunder and lightning, and a swarm of bees: which latter some[6] represent to have occurred when Pompey was moving from Dyrrhachium; others speak of the same or a similar phenomenon after his arrival in Thessaly, and on the day before the battle itself[7]. A storm of thunder and lightning would be nothing extraordinary about the new moon of May, May 1 or 2: and as to the swarm of bees, the earliest date which the ancients assigned to that natural occurrence, for the climate of Greece, was the heliacal rising of the Pleiads, on or about May 6; i. e. almost the very time when Pompey was probably on his march from Apollonia to Thessaly.

5 Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions, xxvi. 255.

6 Valerius Max. i. vi. 12 De Prodigiis. Lucan, Pharsalia, vii. 152—164: Obsequens, cxxv.

7 Dio, xli. 61. Appian, B. C. ii. 68. Florus, iv. 2, 44. 45.

y Ibid. 79, 80: cf. Appian, B. C. ii. 65.

approaching from Macedonia with reinforcements[z]: and he arrived in the neighbourhood of Cæsar a few days after[a]. The two armies had probably come into presence of each other at Pharsalia[b] on or about May 21 or 22.

It is some argument in our opinion that this was the actual time when Cæsar and Pompey thus met, that, according to the Roman reckoning, it would be on or about the viii or vii Kalendas Sextiles; and Sextilis being the regular comitial month, and only six or seven days distant at this time, this coincidence may perhaps explain the fact that one of the first things mentioned afterwards[c] is the disputes among the followers of Pompey relating to the disposal of offices at the next comitia. Be this however as it may, Cæsar began to offer Pompey battle as soon as he had the opportunity of so doing: Re frumentaria præparata confirmatisque militibus et satis longo spatio temporis a Dyrrhachinis præliis intermisso ...continentibus vero diebus ut progrederetur a castris suis collibusque Pompeianis aciem subjiceret[d]. This satis longum spatium could not have been less than three weeks; from May 2 to 22. The offer of battle so made was repeated daily without effect; long enough to make Cæsar despair of its being at last accepted: and he had actually struck his tents, and given the signal to march, intending to remove to some other quarter, (probably because the means of subsistence had now been exhausted in that in which he was,) on the morning of Pharsalia itself[e].

It is an obvious inference from all these facts that, though the armies might have met on or about the 21st or 22nd of May, no battle between them could yet have been fought before the beginning of June: and as June was the solstitial month, and the climate was that of Thessaly, it is no wonder that, if the action began at last in the morning and continued until noon[f], the soldiers of Cæsar should be said to have been distressed by the heat of the weather[f]: nor that on some day

[z] De Bello Civ. iii. 34—38: 31—33: cf. 80. Appian, ii. 60. Plutarch, Cæsar, xxxix. Pompeius, lxvi.

[a] De Bello Civ. iii. 82.

[b] Appian, B. C. ii. 65. Dio, xli. 52.

[c] De Bello Civ. iii. 82, 83. Appian, B. C. ii. 69. Plutarch, Cæsar, xlii. Pompeius, lxvii.

[d] De Bello Civ. iii. 84.

[e] Ibid. 85. Cf. Plutarch, Cæsar, xliii. Pompeius, lxviii. Dio, xli. 55—63. Appian, ii. 68-81.

[f] De Bello Civ. iii. 95. Appian, ii. 78. 81.

just before the battle Plutarch should have spoken of the season of the year as midsummer, and of the heat as excessive: Ἦν μὲν ἀκμὴ θέρους καὶ καῦμα πολύ[g].

In none however of the accounts of these proceedings up to the day of the battle can any thing be discovered which would imply that there was moonlight at this time by night. Plutarch[h] mentions the appearance of a meteor, between midnight and the morning watch, which ran along the sky from the camp of Cæsar to that of Pompey; and that is an indication of a dark night rather than otherwise, after midnight at least. The moon was new May 31: and if the battle was fought at last about the beginning of June it must have been some time in the first quarter of that moon.

And this, it appears to us, is the nearest approximation to the actual date of this memorable battle, at which it would be possible to arrive merely from circumstantial evidence; i. e. from the consideration and comparison of the circumstances which have been left on record before or after it: viz. that it took place most probably in the first week in June, B. C. 48, and after the new moon of that month at least. Possibly too it may be shewn hereafter that this conclusion respecting its date admits of being confirmed by the testimony of some of the Greek lunar calendars of this period. But the actual date of the battle, we may confidently venture to say, never could have been discovered at present by any sagacity of man, neither in terms of the Roman, nor in terms of the Julian, calendar, had it not pleased the Divine Providence that certain fragments of the Julian calendar, almost contemporary with the Julian correction itself, should come down (more or less entire) to our own time; in which the date of the battle is recorded. By the help of these and of our Roman calendar the true date of this memorable event, even at this distance of time, is recoverable and with certainty. It is time therefore for us to have recourse to these, and to see what confirmation of our conclusions is supplied by their testimony.

[g] Brutus, iv.

[h] Pompeius, lxviii. Cæsar, xliii. Dio, xli. 61. Appian, ii. 68. Zonaras, x. 9. 485 C.

v. *On the Calendar date of the battle of Pharsalia.*

If Lucan is to be believed the date of Pharsalia was never consigned to the Roman calendar.

> Pharsalia tanti
> Caussa mali: cedant feralia nomina Cannæ,
> Et damnata diu Romanis Allia Fastis.
> Tempora signavit leviorum Roma malorum,
> Hunc voluit nescire diem[i].

Yet even this would not imply that the date of the event was not once well known. And indeed *to choose to forget*, (which is all that this passage asserts,) would not be possible except of what was before remembered. The utmost then which can be inferred from these words is that, though the date of Pharsalia might once have been inserted in the Fasti, it had afterwards been purposely omitted. But as to the question, whether even this day was not known from the first, and was not recorded in the calendar from the first; whether it was not treated as remarkable, and distinguished in some manner or other, from the first; Appian tells us[k] that among the honours decreed to Cæsar, B. C. 45, after his return from Munda, one was this: Τὴν (δὲ) πόλιν ἄνα ἔτος ἕκαστον (θύειν) αἷς αὐτὸς ἡμέραις ἐν παρατάξεσιν ἐνίκα: and a similar decree was afterwards passed B. C. 36, in honour of Augustus[l]. If these days were to be celebrated by such sacrifices, and to be kept as feriæ or holidays; they must be recorded in the calendar also.

Accordingly in the extant remains of the Julian calendar[m], above alluded to, we find actual notices of most of the victories or successes of Julius Cæsar; his reduction of Spain (August or Sextilis 2), his victory over Pharnaces (August or Sextilis 2), his reduction of Alexandria (March 27 Roman): which renders it only the more probable that the date of the first and most important of all, Pharsalia, must some time or other have been placed upon record also.

And this appears to have been actually the case. In the

[i] Pharsalia, vii. 407.
[k] De Bello Civ. ii. 106. Cf. Dio, xliii. 42–44: xlv. 7: xlvii. 18.
[l] App. B. C. v. 130. Cf. Dio, xlix. 15: li. 1. 19. Suetonius, Caius, xxiii. 3. Dio, lix. 20. And the Amiternine Calendar in Sept. 2.
[m] Apud Foggini.

Antiatine fragment of the Julian calendar[m], opposite to the v Idus Augustas or Sextiles, we find the words DIVUS. JUL. PHARS. VICIT: i. e. *Divus Julius Pharsali vicit.* In the Maffæan[m] opposite to the same day we meet with the entry Hoc DIE CÆSAR HISPALI VIC. where *Hispali* is clearly an error for *Pharsali.* In the Amiternine[m] opposite to the same day stand the words: SOLI INDIGETI IN COLLE QUIRINALE FER. Q. EO D. C. CÆS. C. F. PHARSALI DEVICIT: i. e. Soli Indigeti in colle Quirinali Feriæ, quod eo die Caius Cæsar Caii Filius Pharsali devicit. Lastly in the Capranic fragment[m] (though opposite to the vi Idus Sextiles) we find the notice SOL. INDIGETIS. IN COLLE. QUIRINALE SACRIFICIUM. PUBLICUM: i. e. Solis Indigetis...sacrificium publicum: a comparison of which with the entry in the Amiternine opposite to v Idus Sextiles shews that this too must really have been meant of that day.

Now these are all the fragments of the Julian calendar (more or less entire for the month of August or Sextilis in particular,) which have yet come to light; and in each of them, we see, a date is found the same in terms, which can be nothing but that of Pharsalia. Nor perhaps among these is any in need of illustration, to make it clearer and more intelligible than it is as it stands, except those particular entries of the Amiternine and the Capranic calendar respectively, which connect this registered date of Pharsalia with a stated sacrifice to the Sol Indiges in colle Quirinale or Quirinali.

And with respect to this, it might always have been inferred from this very connection that by the Sol Indiges, so associated with the date of Pharsalia, Julius Cæsar himself most probably must have been intended. And this very probable inference would turn out not to have been mistaken.

The grammarian Festus[n] explains this title of *Indiges,* applied to the gods, as if it denoted those Quorum nomina vulgari non *licebat:* but its proper meaning in Latin seems to have been much the same as that of δαίμων or ἀνθρωποδαίμων among the Greeks; Qui ex homine deus factus. It was applied by Ascanius to Æneas, after his disappearance in the

[m] Ibid. loc. cit.

[n] ix. 186. 6 Indigetes.

battle with Mezentius[o]: and Dionysius expresses its signification as so applied in Greek, according to his own construction of its meaning, by Πατὴρ θεὸς χθόνιος[p]. And that such was his recognized style and title ever after, (viz. that of the Deus Indiges,) appears from Virgil and Ovid:

> Indigetem Ænean scis ipse et sæpe fateris
> Deberi cœlo[q]

> Fecitque deum quem turba Quirini
> Nuncupat Indigetem temploque arisque recepit[r].

Servius' commentary on the preceding from Virgil[q] is: Et Indigetes dii duplici ratione dicuntur, vel secundum Lucretium quod *nullius rei indigeant*[s] qui ait:

> Ipsa suis pollens opibus nihil indiga nostri[t],

vel quod nos deorum *indigeamus*, unde quidam omnes deos *indigetes* appellari volunt. alii *patrios* deos *indigetes* dici debere tradunt: alii ab invocatione *indigetes* dictos volunt, quod *indigeto* est precor et invoco. vel certe *indigetes* sunt dii ex hominibus facti, et dicti *indigetes* quasi in *diis* agentes. And commenting in like manner on Virgil's

> Dii patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater[u],

he observes: *Patrii* dii sunt qui præsunt singulis civitatibus, ut Minerva Athenis Juno Carthagini. *Indigetes* autem proprie sunt dii ex hominibus facti quasi in diis agentes. abusive autem omnes dii generaliter possunt dici Indigetes, tamquam nullius rei egentes *.

* The Dii Indigetes are invoked, Livy, viii. 9, at the time of the devotion of Decius, along with the Divi Novensiles, of whom see Vol. ii. 394.

> Dii precor Æneæ comites quibus ensis et ignis
> Cesserunt, *Diique Indigetes*, genitorque Quirine
> Urbis, et invicti genitor Gradive Quirini,
> Vestaque Cæsareos inter sacrata Penates,
> Et cum Cæsarea tu Phœbe domestice Vesta,
> Quique tenes altus Tarpeias Juppiter arces,

o Livy, i. 2. Festus, ix. 186–1 Indiges. Origo Gentis Romanæ, p. 17, 18. Pliny, H. N. iii. 9. p. 590. Solinus, ii. § 15. A. Gellius, ii. 16. Cf. Macrobius, Somn. Scip. i. 9. p. 50.

p i. 64. He must have construed Indiges in the sense of πατὴρ or πάτριος.

q Æn. xii. 794. Cf. ad i. 259: iv. 620: and Servius, in loc.

r Metamorphos. xiv. 607.

s Cf. Fulgentius, Mythologicῶν iii. v. p. 110: De Berecynthia et Atti. Ideo et apud Romanos Indigetes, quasi nihil indigentes.

t ii. 649.

u Georgica, i, 498.

This title then of Indiges would be given to Julius Cæsar, (if supposed to have been deified after his death,) as matter of course. And with respect to that of Sol or the Sun, associated with it: Servius, on Virgil's allusion

Nimbo effulgens [w],

observes: Est enim fulgidum lumen quo deorum capita cinguntur: sic etiam pingi solent: so that to be crowned with rays, to have a kind of halo (radiance or coruscation) about the head, was a symbol of divinity. Now Julius Cæsar was so distinguished, and even before his death. Among the honours decreed him, B. C. 45, as Florus supposes [x], one was In theatro distincta radiis corona. Lucan observes [y]:

Bella pares superis facient civilia divos:
Fulminibus manes radiisque ornabit et astris,
Inque deûm templis jurabit Roma per umbras.

On which the Scholiast: Habitu enim Jovis in templo Cæsar est constitutus. accepit et radios ut solis esset simulacrum: that is, as the Sol Indiges; in this specific character of the Sol Indiges of the calendar.

Ille deûm gens
Stelligerum attollens apicem Trojanus Iülo
Cæsar avo [z].

Cæsar in urbe sua deus est quem Marte togaque
Præcipuum non bella magis finita triumphis
Resque domi gestæ properataque gloria rerum
In sidus vertere novum stellamque comantem,
Quam sua progenies [a].

Quosque alios vati fas appellare piumque,
Tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior ævo
Qua caput Augustum quem temperat orbe relicto
Accedat cœlo faveatque precantibus absens.
Ovid, Metam. xv. 861.

[w] Æneid, ii. 616.
[x] iv. 2, 91.
[y] Pharsalia, vii. 457.
[z] Silius Italicus, Punica, xiii. 862.
[a] Ovid, Metam. xv. 746. Hence in his description of the Anima of Æneas,

Luna volat altius illa,
Flammiferumque trahens spatioso limite crinem
Stella micat; natique videns benefacta fatetur
Esse suis majora, et vinci gaudet ab illo.
xv. 848.

Daphni! quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?
Ecce! Dionæi processit Cæsaris astrum:
Astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus, et quo
Duceret apricis in collibus uva colorem[b].

In each of these three allusions the emblem of the deified Cæsar is recognized or represented as a star. The matter of fact which explains that is the following.

i. Servius, on the passage just quoted from Virgil: Cum Augustus Cæsar ludos funebres patri celebraret, die medio stella apparuit[c]— Bæbius Macer circa horam octavam stellam amplissimam quasi lemniscis coronatam ortam dicit: quam quidam ad inlustrandam gloriam Cæsaris juvenis pertinere existimabant: ipse animam patris sui esse voluit; eique in Capitolio statuam super caput auream stellam habentem posuit: (cui) inscriptum in basi fuit: Cæsari Hemitheo*. And again, on Virgil's,

Patriumque aperitur vertice sidus[d]:

Nam ex quo tempore per diem stella visa est, dum sacrificaretur Veneri Genitrici, et ludi funebres Cæsari exhiberentur, per triduum stella apparuit in septemtrione, quod sidus Cæsaris putatum est, Augusto persuadente. nam ideo Augustus omnibus statuis quas ob divinitatem Cæsaris statuit hanc stellam adjecit. ipse vero Augustus in honorem patris stellam in galea cœpit habere depictam.

ii. Cometes in uno totius orbis loco colitur in templo Romæ, admodum faustus Divo Augusto judicatus ab ipso. qui incipiente eo apparuit ludis quos faciebat Veneri Genitrici non

* We are told by Dio that a statue so inscribed was decreed to Cæsar, B. C. 46, after the Bellum Africanum, xliii. 14: *Ἅρμα τέ τι αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ ἀντιπρόσωπον τῷ Διὶ ἱδρυθῆναι, καὶ ἐπὶ εἰκόνα αὐτὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης χαλκοῦν ἐπιβιβασθῆναι, γραφὴν ἔχοντα ὅτι Ἡμίθεός ἐστι.* Yet cap. 20 he informs us also that Cæsar caused this inscription to be erased. A statue was erected to him also B.C. 45 in the Temple of Quirinus, under the title of *Θεὸς Ἀνίκητος*: Dio, xliii. 45: cf. xliv. 6: xlv. 6. The Amiternine calendar shews that the date of this was vii Kal. Junias, May 26 Roman, that year. See Vol. ii. 125. The Temple of Quirinus was on the Quirinal Hill. Hence the Sacrum Solis Indigetis, (in the sense of Cæsar,) in colle Quirinali.

[b] Virgil, Eclogæ, ix. 46–49.
[c] Cf. Ad Æn. i. 287: vi. 791.
[d] Æneid, viii. 681.

multo post obitum patris Cæsaris, in collegio ab eo instituto. namque his verbis[e] id gaudium prodidit: Iis ipsis ludorum meorum diebus sidus crinitum per septem dies in regione cœli quæ sub septemtrionibus est conspectum, id oriebatur circa undecimam horam diei, clarumque et omnibus e terris conspicuum fuit. eo sidere significari vulgus credidit Cæsaris animam inter deorum immortalium numina receptam. quo nomine id insigne simulacro capitis ejus quod mox in foro consecravimus adjectum est[f].

The appearance of this comet for seven days is attested by Suetonius also[g]: Ludis quos primos consecratos ei heres Augustus edebat stella crinita per septem dies continuos fulsit, exoriens circa undecimam horam: creditumque est animam esse Cæsaris in cœlum recepti, et hac de caussa simulacro ejus in vertice additur stella. And though he seems to have thought that these were the Ludi Victoriæ Cæsaris, (the date of which the Maffæan and Amiternine calendars fix to xiii Kalendas Augusti, July 20 Roman,) there can be no doubt, after the testimonies just produced[h], that they were the Ludi Veneris Genitricis September 25 or 26 Roman, celebrated B. C. 44. Plutarch confounds the time of the appearance of this comet with that of the funeral rites of Cæsar[i], March 17–23 Roman; the reason of which may have been that another comet appeared B. C. 43 also[k], and possibly in the month of March.

There cannot consequently be any doubt that Julius Cæsar was deified even in his lifetime, and certainly after his death; and that the attributes, emblems, or symbols of his divinity were such as would have been most suitable for the character and person of such a deity as the sun, a crown of rays, and a star: which may render it less surprising that he should have been actually deified under the title of Sol Indiges. And if his feast-day or holiday in that capacity was fixed to the v Idus Augustas or Sextiles, as it is seen to have been, there can be

[e] Probably in the Latin Exemplar of the Marmor Ancyranum.

[f] Pliny, H. N. ii. 23. p. 280. Cf. Seneca, v. 15. Natural. Quæst. i. 1. 3. Dio, xlv. 6. 7: adds that for the same reason another was set up In Templo Veneris Genitricis. Cf. Obsequens, exxviii. Pliny, H. N. ii. 22. p. 275. Servius, ad Æn. x. 272. Zonaras, x. 13. 495 A. B.

[g] Vita, lxxxviii. 2. Cf. Augustus, x. 3.

[h] Cf. also Appian, B. C. iii. 28.

[i] Vita, lxix.

[k] Cf. Dio, xlv. 17. Cf. Vol. ii. 625.

no question that it must have been so fixed out of compliment to the first and greatest of his victories in the civil war, that of Pharsalia; which the other Julian calendars date on the same day.

Now Sextilis 9 U. C. 706 according to our scheme of the Irregular calendar, Period vii. 17, coincided with June 5 B. C. 48. This then must have been the true Julian date of Pharsalia; June 5 B. C. 48: and it comes so close to the time of that month to which we have already seen reason to fix it, that a more complete confirmation of our conclusions could not be desired. Our reasonings indeed were founded on circumstantial evidence; yet they must have had a foundation in fact and must have been rightly conducted to lead us to that conclusion.

vi. *On the date of the death of Pompey; and of the arrival of Cæsar at Alexandria.*

Having dwelt so long on the illustration of this particular date, we shall not consider the chronology of any more of the events of the present consular year, except one, the death of Pompey.

With regard to the date of his death, testimony differs; though the difference is *παρὰ μικρόν*. We find it stated that he was killed *on* his birthday, and on the day *before* his birthday, and on the day *after* his birthday. And possibly this variation of statements concerning this particular fact, circumstanced as it is, may be explained as follows.

It is agreed that the triumph of Pompey, De Mithridate, De Piratis, and De Oriente in general, was celebrated *Per Biduum*[1]; and that these two days were iii Kalendas Octobres, and Pridie Kalendas Octobres; the latter of which was his true birthday[m]—though the former might easily have been supposed to be so. It is agreed too that by a remarkable coincidence he was killed on one of those days on which he had celebrated his triumph; and in reality on the second, Pridie Kalendas Octobres, September 29 Roman, his actual birthday. His birthday might be rightly assumed Pridie Kal. Octobres, and yet the day of his death be supposed to have been the first of the two days of his triumph; iii Kal. Oct.: in

[1] See Vol. ii. 91. xcviii. [m] Supra, 263.

which case it might be said that he was killed Pridie Natales, as it is by Velleius Paterculus[n]. Or his birthday might have been supposed iii Kal. Oct. and the day of his death the second of the two days of his triumph; in which case it might be said that he perished the day after his birthday, as it is by Plutarch in his life of Pompey[o]. But the true day of his death was his birthday, September 29 Roman U. C. 706, July 24 B. C. 48: and so it is represented by Plutarch himself in two other instances[p].

It follows that between the Roman date of Pharsalia Sextilis 9, and the Roman date of this death September 29, the interval was 49 days exactly. So also between the Julian date of the former June 5, and that of the latter July 24. The question therefore cannot be concerning the magnitude or amount of this interval, but only in what manner it is to be filled up and accounted for by means of intermediate events.

And here it would be obvious to remark that the circumstances found on record, between the escape of Pompey from the field of Pharsalia (which all our authorities date on the day of the battle[q]) and his death, at first sight do not appear competent to have occupied such an interval of time as this; and we ourselves were so far misled by the *prima facie* construction of these accounts as to pronounce a very confident opinion[r] that a fortnight's interval was the utmost which could be supposed to have elapsed between the battle of Pharsalia and the death of Pompey.

But the truth is that, though Cæsar himself set out in

[n] ii. 53.

[o] Cap. lxxix.

[p] Camillus, xix: Symposiaca, viii. i. 1. Cf. Dio, xlii. 5. Appian, B. C. ii. 86. Zonaras, x. 9. 487 C. Cicero, De Divinatione, ii. 9, 22. Lucan misled by the ambiguity of the Roman date of the death of Pompey, Sept. 29, and not reflecting on the inequality of the civil year to the natural at the time, supposes the day of the arrival of Pompey at the Mons Casius, which was also that of his death, the day of the autumnal equinox.

> Tempus erat quo Libra pares examinat horas,
> Non uno plus æqua die; noctique rependit
> Lux minor hibernæ verni solatia damni.
>
> viii. 467.

[q] Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 96. 102. Plutarch, Pompeius, lxxiii–lxxix. lxxx. Cæsar, xlv. Appian, B. C. ii. 81: 83–86: 88: 89. Dio, xlii. 2–5: 6–8. Cicero, Tusculanæ, iii. 27, 66. Lucan, Pharsalia, vii. 677: viii. 851: ix. 950–1007. Valerius Max. iv. v. 5 De Verecundia: i. v. 6, De Ominibus.

[r] Dissertations on the Principles, &c. iii. 643: Appendix, Diss. xiv.

pursuit of Pompey with a body of horse, he was followed by one legion at least on foot: Cæsar omnibus rebus relictis persequendum sibi Pompeium existimavit . . . et quantumcunque itineris equitatu efficere poterat quotidie progrediebatur . . . legionemque unam minoribus itineribus subsequi jussit[s]: and both this, and another, commanded by Q. Fusius Kalenus, which had been summoned from Achaia[t], must have marched by land as far as Ephesus[u] before they took ship for Egypt.

We may date the commencement of this pursuit on the third day after the battle[w] June 7; and from Larissa[w]. Now the distance from Larissa to Ephesus, by the maps, was 470 Roman miles direct, 530 by road: which, at an average of 11·3 Roman miles 9 British by day, would require 47 days' march at least. Nor perhaps for a long march like this and without interruption could a greater average rate of the march daily be supposed[x]. Forty-seven days however are the utmost interval which could be allowed for the march of these legions to Ephesus, if both they and Cæsar actually arrived at Alexandria in Egypt only *three* days after the death of Pompey[y]; and consequently not later than July 26 or 27, October 2 or 3 Roman. And though the Etesian winds might possibly have set in before that time[z], and would be in favour of the passage from the coast of Asia to that of Egypt; still the length of the voyage even from Rhodes or Cyprus to Egypt is not represented under any circumstances as less than three or four days[a]; and on this occasion (from the Hellespont to Egypt) Lucan reckons it six days' and seven nights' sail[b] *.

* The utmost length of time which could thus be allowed for the march of Cæsar all the way by land to Ephesus, (if they embarked there for Rhodes, see De Bello, iii. 105, 106,) would be from June 7 to July 21, that is, 44 days: at the rate of 12 Roman miles a day. Such a march

[s] De Bello Civ. iii. 102.
[t] Ibid. 106. Cf. Dio, xlii. 13, 14.
[u] De Bello Civ. iii. 105, 106. Cf. Seneca, i. 176, Ad Helviam, ix. 6.
[w] Cf. Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 98. 102. Appian, B. C. ii. 88. Dio, xlii. 6. Plutarch, Antonius, viii.
[x] Cf. our Fasti Catholici, i. 252 note.
[y] Livy, cxii. Appian, B. C. ii. 89. Cæsar, De Bello Civili, iii. 106. Cf. Anecdota Græca Parisiensia, ii. 18. l. 15.
[z] Cf. Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 107.
[a] Cf. Photius, Cod. 250. p. 454. l. 37 -455. l. 6.
[b] Pharsalia, ix. 1000—1007.

In fact it appears that Cæsar actually set out to Egypt from Rhodes, partly with the ships of L. Cassius, which had surrendered to him at the Hellespont[c], partly with such as he had got from the Rhodians[d]: and no doubt these carried some of his troops, previously transported thither from the continent. From Rhodes, with the aid of the Etesian winds, the passage to Alexandria might be made in three or four days' and nights' time. We may presume then that he must have set sail from that island[e] on the day of the death of Pompey, July 24; and have arrived at Alexandria on the third day after it, July 27. It appears from Appian[d] that he set out in the evening with a lantern or light in his ship; which is a proof that there was no moon: and that could not fail to be the case on the evening of July 24, when the moon was 25 days old at least.

Cæsar's own testimony[e] seems to be express to the fact that he sailed directly to Alexandria, and first heard of the death of Pompey there; and the same thing may be collected from Appian[f]. The death of Pompey was already known of at Alexandria when he arrived; and that was possible: the scene of his death having been Mount Casius[g], only 200 miles direct from Alexandria; which special messengers might easily travel in three days' and two nights' time. It is agreed however that he did not land before the head and the ring of Pompey were brought to him[h]: and probably that would not be until the return of the king.

was possible. His troops might indeed have come by sea from the Hellespont to Ephesus, in the ships of Cassius; which would materially shorten that part of the journey. But Cæsar himself certainly appears to have marched to Ephesus by land: iii. 105, 106.

[c] Appian, B. C. ii. 88. Dio, xlii. 6. Suetonius, Julius, lxiii. 2.

[d] Appian, B. C. ii. 89.

[e] De Bello Civ. iii. 106.

[f] ii. 89. Dio (xlii. 7.) seems to imply that he sailed to Pelusium first, and then to Alexandria: cf. Plutarch, Cæsar, xlviii: Livy, cxii.

[g] Plutarch, Pompeius, lxxvii. lxxx: Cæsar, xlviii. Appian, B. C. ii. 84 86. Dio, xlii. 3. 5. 8. Strabo, xvi. 2. Historiæ Aug. SS. Adrian, 14. Dio, lxix. 11.

[h] Livy, cxii. Dio, xlii. 7, 8: cf. 18. Plutarch, Cæsar, xlviii: Pompeius, lxxx. Valerius Max. v. i. 10 De Clementia. Auctor De Viris, Pompeius Magnus: Julius Cæsar.

vii. *On the date of the return of Cicero from Dyrrhachium to Italy.*

And here we should wish to close our review of the chronology of this year, were it not still necessary to say a few words in reference to the movements of Cicero; of which we have had no further account since the Ides of Quinctilis, May 11.

It has been seen that at the time of Pharsalia he was at Dyrrhachium; and we may perhaps have a future opportunity of considering his own account of the first events which ensued there after the receipt of the news of that battle. We know too that he determined himself to retire from any further participation in the civil war; and it would seem that it must have been recommended to him by Cæsar, through Dolabella his son-in-law[i], to return to Italy and abide the result of the contest there: and that he thought it expedient to comply with that advice, under the expectation probably that Cæsar himself would not be long in returning to Italy also[k].

We do not however know when he set out; or how long he was on the road. That he did not sail directly from Dyrrachium to Brundisium appears from the fact that he was at Patræ in Achaia by the way[l]; and left his brother Quintus there. The first letter with a date is from Brundisium, to Terentia[m], Pridie Nonas Novembres U. C. 706, August 28 B. C. 48; two months and twenty-three days after the date of Pharsalia, June 5. But he had not then only just returned. The letter was in answer to one of Terentia's, which had been written in reply to one of his own to her; and perhaps that which first announced to her the fact of his return. And as she was at a distance from Brundisium, it might require a month to get her answer to it.

The first letter to Atticus after the return[n] is without a date. The next[o] is dated iv Kalendas Decembres, Sept. 20;

[i] Ad Fam. xv. 15. C. Cassio: cf. Ad Attic. xi. 6. Plutarch, Cicero, xxxix. Dio, xlii. 10.

[k] Ad Attic. xi. 7.

[l] Ibid 5. 7. 8. 10. 11. 16: cf. xi. 9.

[m] Ad Fam. xiv, 12: cf. xi. 27: vii. 3.

[n] xi. 1.

[o] Ibid. 6: cf. xi. 9: written on Cicero's birthday U. C. 707, Oct. 24 B. C. 48: which shews that he purposely returned to Italy before Dec. 10 Roman, at least; the end of the Tribunician year, U. C. 706.

and he was then aware of the death of Pompey. The same thing appears from the next letter[p], dated xiv Kalendas Januarias, October 9. And at this season of the year, when the Etesian winds were adverse to the transmission of news from Alexandria, it is not probable that the despatches of Cæsar which announced the fact would arrive under six weeks at least[q]; i. e. before the middle of September. The news seems to have been brought by Cæsar's freedman Diochares[r], bearer of letters from Cæsar himself also, alluded to in the Epistle to Atticus[o]: and this was probably the first official communication sent by Cæsar to Rome, since his departure the year before Pharsalia; for after Pharsalia he sent none[s].

On this principle, the statement in Dio[t], that the different Ἀρχαιρεσίαι, comitia, or elections of the year, which had been purposely reserved for the return of Cæsar in person, were held at last Ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ἔτους, is very likely to have been true. It comes in indeed B. C. 47; but it belongs in reality to this year, B. C. 48. It could scarcely be otherwise; if the return of Cæsar continued to be expected, down to the arrival of these tidings from Alexandria, confirmed by his own letters, and by the ring of Pompey[r].

We trace the letters of Cicero after this down to the vi Kal. Jan.[u] October 17; and to Pridie Kal. Jan.[w] October 21: which are all that remain with dates, belonging to this year. The next with a date was on his birthday[x], iii Nonas Januarias; consequently in the next consular year, though on October 24 B. C. 48.

Section V.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 18. 354 *days.*

U. C. 707 Varr. 706 Cap. 704 Polyb. B. C. 48–47.

C. Julius Cæsar Dict. ii
M. Antonius Mag. Equit.

Kalendæ Januariæ October 22 B. C. 48. Nundinal Char. 8.

[p] xi. 7.
[q] Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. i. 306: iii. 382.
[r] Cf. Dio, xlii. 18.
[s] Cicero, Oratio lvi. Philippica, xiv. 8, 23: cf. Dio, xlii. 18. Plutarch, Cæsar, lvi.
[t] xlii. 20.
[u] Ad Attic. xi. 8.
[w] Ad Fam. xiv. 16.
[x] Ad Attic. xi. 9.

i. *On the chronology of the* Bellum Alexandrinum.

The principal events of this consular year were the Alexandrine war and the war with Pharnaces. We shall briefly consider, the chronology of each, in order to shew how the chronology of each confirms our calendar, and in its turn is illustrated and authenticated by our calendar.

The close of the Alexandrine war is known. The submission of Alexandria ensued with little or no delay on the last battle of the Alexandrines with Cæsar, and their last defeat by him; in escaping from which the young king Ptolemy was drowned in the Nile[y]: and this submission is dated in the Maffæan calendar on the vi Kalendas Apriles, March 27. Roman; opposite to which day in that calendar stands the entry, HOC DIE CÆSAR ALEXANDR. RECEPIT: and we have seen that the authenticity of these dates may be depended on. And hence the first confirmation of our Roman calendar of the year, deducible from the true chronology of this war. For the year of the submission was undoubtedly U. C. 707; and it appears from our calendar that the vi Kal. Apriles (March 27 Roman) U. C. 707 fell on January 12 B. C. 47. Consequently the conclusion of the war by the submission in question coincided with the middle of winter, for any climate of the Roman empire, except that of Egypt itself. If then it had lasted three or four months previously it must have begun *before* winter, and yet must have been waged *in* the winter. Accordingly it is so represented by Suetonius[z]: Et fugientem (sc. Pompeium) Alexandriam persecutus ut occisum deprehendit cum Ptolemæo rege, a quo sibi quoque insidias tendi videbat, bellum sane difficillimum gessit, neque loco neque tempore æquo, sed *hieme* anni, et intra mœnia copiosissimi et sollertissimi hostis, inops ipse rerum omnium atque imparatus.

The date of the conclusion of the war being thus known; there are certain facts upon record by means of which we can approximate to that of its commencement also.

It appears[a] that Cn. Domitius Calvinus, (whom Cæsar had

[y] De Bello Alex. 28—32. [z] Julius Cæsar, xxxv. 1.
[a] De Bello Alex. 9: 34.

left in command of the army in Asia when he himself set out to Egypt[b],) after the war had broken out and had been going on some time sent two legions to his assistance; one by sea[c] the other by land[d]. This latter, it is said, In bello Alexandrino non occurrit, quod itinere terrestri per Syriam erat missa[a]. That is, it arrived too late to take any part in the war. Consequently after January 12 B. C. 47, at the earliest.

Now, if we may only assume that it was dispatched from Ephesus[d]; the distance from Ephesus to Alexandria all the way by land cannot be estimated at less than 1250 Roman miles direct, 1406 by road: and though that would require 100 days' march at the rate of 14 Roman miles a day; it might not require much more: so that if this legion did not arrive until some time after January 12 B. C. 47 it could not have been sent later than the beginning of October B. C. 48.

It appears however that when this legion was despatched by land another was sent at the same time by sea: and the arrival of this at its destination is dated by the Auctor De Bello Alex.[e] critically during the *two* days on which Cæsar was employed at Alexandria in sinking wells to supply the want of fresh water[f]. The wind being easterly at the time, this legion had not been able to make the port of Alexandria, but had been carried further up the coast to the west: Ad littora Africæ paullo supra Alexandriam: and as the same wind still continued to blow, they sent word of their situation to Cæsar in Alexandria Navigio actuario[g]: i. e. by a ship manned with rowers.

Now from the account of his junction with these reinforcements at last, and of the attack which the Alexandrines made upon him as he was returning[h], it is clear that the junction must have been effected at a time when the nights were dark; and consequently when there was no moon: Duabus de caussis (Cæsar) eo die dimicare nolebat, quod et nullos milites in navibus habebat, (i. e. in his ships of war, only in the Naves onerariæ, or transports,) et post horam decimam diei res agebatur. *nox* autem adlatura videbatur majorem

[b] Ibid. 34. Dio, xlii. 46: 45.
[c] De Bello Alex. 9.
[d] Cf. De Bello Civ. iii. 105–107. Dio, xlii. 37: 39: 40.
[e] Cap. 9. [f] Cap. 5–9.
[g] Cap. 10, 11. [h] Ibid.

fiduciam illis qui locorum notitia confidebant. And though he was nevertheless compelled to fight, and was victorious in the battle itself, yet the arrival of night prevented him from following up his success, and capturing the whole fleet of the enemy: Quod nisi *nox* prælium diremisset tota classe hostium Cæsar potitus esset[i].

Now the new moons of the autumnal quarter, B. C. 48, may be assumed to have fallen on September 26, October 25, and November 24 respectively; and therefore the full moons on October 10, November 8, and December 8, respectively also. We are entirely of opinion that this battle with the Alexandrines by sea, when Cæsar was returning with his reinforcements, must have been fought in the *last* quarter of one of these moons; some time after October 17, or November 15, or December 15. The last of these dates is excluded, as much too near to the close of the war itself, January 12 B. C. 47. The second might be admissible, though probably for the same reason scarcely so. But the first is by far the most likely to have been the truth; both because the arrival of these reinforcements by sea, and Cæsar's junction with them, were evidently among the earliest events of the war, after it had fairly broken out: and because the mission of this legion by sea, and that of the other by land, each in obedience to orders from Cæsar, and each for the same purpose, would naturally be as nearly as possible synchronous; and if the latter could not have been later than the beginning of October, neither could the former.

Let us assume that this legion was actually dispatched by sea about the full moon of October, October 8; and that it was sent from Ephesus. The length of the voyage to the coast of Egypt could not have been less than a week; and its detention on the coast of Africa, even after the passage, before its junction with Cæsar being reckoned at about as much more, its actual junction with him at last, and the battle by sea as he was returning to Alexandria would actually bear date on or about October 22; only three days before the change of the moon, when the nights would necessarily be dark.

But the war itself had broken out two or three weeks at

[i] De Bello Alex. Cap. 11.

least before this junction. It would require six or seven days to make Domitius in Asia acquainted with Cæsar's situation at Alexandria; and, if the former actually dispatched the legion to his assistance on or about October 8, the latter must have sent him word of the state of things at Alexandria on or about October 1. And here the Epistles of Cicero come in to throw further light on the actual chronology of these proceedings in Egypt; and thereby to confirm our conclusions.

There is a letter to Atticus[k] dated on the xviii* Kalendas Quinctiles, this year, in which he observes with reference to Cæsar: Illum ab Alexandria discessisse nemo nuntiat; constatque ne profectum quidem illinc quemquam post Idus Martias: nec post Idus Decembres ab illo datas ullas litteras: ex quo intelligis illud de litteris a. d. v. Idus Februarias datis (quod inane esset etiamsi verum esset) non verum esse. The v Idus Februarias would be November 28 B. C. 48: and what Cicero meant by this last observation probably was that even though Cæsar had actually written letters of that date they would prove nothing of the time when he was to be expected to return, so long after; i. e. when he himself was writing to Atticus, on the xviii Kal. Quinctiles. What he said indeed of no one's having left Alexandria later than the Ides of March last before the date of this letter would be explained in part by the season of the year; for the Ides of March U. C. 707 coincided with December 31 B. C. 48: when no one, who could possibly help it, would have thought of sailing from Egypt to Italy. But he added that it was well known no letters had been received from Alexandria of a later date than the Ides of December; and that could not be explained by the season of the year: for the Ides of December U. C. 706 were not later than October 5 B. C. 48. It can be explained only by the fact that the war itself must by that time

* This date must be corrupt; there being no such day as the xviii Kal. Quinctiles in the month of June at this time. The next letter, written soon after this, is dated xii Kal. Quinctiles. Probably the true reading was the xvii Kal. Quinctiles, June 14 Roman March 31 B. C. 47. Cf. Ad Fam. xiv. 4, which confirms this correction.

[k] xi. 17.

have broken out. And if so, this coincidence ought to be considered a great confirmation of the date to which we have conjecturally fixed its commencement; viz. on or about October 1.

It appears also from another letter to Atticus[l], dated on the xii Kalendas Februarias, Nov. 9 B. C. 48, that Cicero's brother Quintus' son, the younger Quintus, was at Ephesus on the vi Idus Decembres, September 30, B. C. 48; and (as the context of the letter implies) on his way at that time to Cæsar in Alexandria*. Yet he actually joined or actually saw Cæsar first only at Antioch, the next year[m]. It is nothing improbable that the arrival of Cæsar's letters to Domitius, at Ephesus[n], a few days after September 30, apprising him of the breaking out of the war and of his own critical situation, was the very thing which stopped this proposed visit of the younger Cicero to Egypt just at this juncture of time, and made him postpone his interview with Cæsar to a more convenient season.

The actual commencement of hostilities at Alexandria may consequently be dated about the end of September, B. C. 48. It is clear at least from the account of subsequent proceedings that though the Etesian winds were blowing, when Cæsar arrived, on July 27 or soon after that day[o], winds from a different quarter were blowing when the war had broken out[p]; and no such winds ordinarily set in until after the cessation of the Etesiæ: the stated time of which in all the Parapegmata of antiquity was from September 1—5. Nor in the course of these proceedings is there a single allusion to the inundation of the Nile[q]; and that too would be over towards the beginning of October. This date of the commencement of the contest also explains the language attri-

* Q. Cicero and his son, according to Cornelius Nepos' Life of Atticus, were both made prisoners in Pompey's camp on the day of Pharsalia, and both, as he also states, dismissed thence in safety by Cæsar, for Atticus' sake; the brother-in-law of the elder, and the uncle of the younger, Quintus.

[l] xi. 10: cf. 16.

[m] xi. 20: cf. 21. Also De Bello Alex. 65.

[n] Cf. Cicero, Oratio xlii, Pro Rege Dejotaro, 5, 14: 9, 24.

[o] De Bello Civili, iii. 107.

[p] De Bello Alex. 9: cf. 1: 3.

[q] Ibid. 5—9.

buted to the Alexandrines just before: Idque agendum mature: namque eum interclusum tempestatibus propter anni tempus recipere transmarina auxilia non posse[r]. On or after October 1 the sea would be considered as good as shut.

It appears also that, among those who brought reinforcements to Cæsar by land and contributed materially to the successful termination of the war, Mithridates of Pergamus was one[s]; whom, on that account and for other services which he had also rendered him, Cæsar, B. C. 47, before he left Asia, rewarded with the kingdom of the Bosporus, taken away from Pharnaces[t]. His cooperation with Cæsar on this occasion is particularly noticed by Josephus[u]; because Antipater, the father of Herod, accompanied him on the same service with a body of Jewish auxiliaries.

Now he was sent into Syria and Cilicia Initio belli Alexandrini[w] to obtain reinforcements from that quarter; and he had those forces to collect when he got there. Let us suppose that he was sent at the time when Cæsar notified his situation to Domitius at Ephesus; and that he ultimately began his march back from Tarsus in Cilicia: and let us suppose too that he was sent by sea. The distance from Tarsus to Pelusium in Egypt by land was 630 Roman miles direct, 711 by road; and that would require 55 days' march at the rate of 13 miles a day. And yet it would be nearly 50 days' march less than from Ephesus. If then he set out upon his return to Egypt at the beginning of November (about a month after the time when he was probably sent into Syria and Cilicia) he might arrive at Pelusium about the end of December; long before the reinforcements despatched by Domitius could yet have done so. And the course of events from the capture of Pelusium (which he took in one day[x]) down to his junction with Cæsar, and the final battle with the Alexandrines, followed by the submission of the

[r] De Bello Alex. 3.

[s] Ibid. 26–28. Cf. Dio, xlii. 41: 48: xlvii. 26.

[t] De Bello Alex. 78. Appian, Mithridatica, 121. Cf. Dio, xlvii. 26. Cicero, De Divin. ii. 37, 79.

[u] Ant. Jud. xiv. viii. 1–3: x. 2: cf. xvi. ii. 4. p. 644 ad calc. vi. 2. De Bello, i. ix. 3—5: x. 3.

[w] De Bello Alex. 26. Cf. 1. Dio, xlii. 37: 39: 41.

[x] De Bello Alex. 26.

city on January 12*, will strongly imply that he could not have arrived long before the end of December. The first allusion to his approach coincides with the time when Cæsar, at the request of the people of Alexandria, and under pretence of superseding Arsinoë (his sister) in the kingdom, dismissed king Ptolemy [y]; which is thus probably determined to the end of December B. C. 48.

From these premises too it will follow that, if the second week in October B. C. 48 was the time when Domitius Calvinus sent the legion to Cæsar by sea, it must also have been the time when he himself was preparing to march against Pharnaces [z]: but as he had to assemble his forces from very distant parts of Asia [z], and had to march at last to Nicopolis [a] before he encountered Pharnaces [b], we may conclude that the actual date of his defeat on that occasion would probably be the beginning of December. The night before this battle [c] couriers from Cæsar to Domitius were intercepted by Pharnaces, with fresh letters to Domitius; urging him to make still greater efforts to come to his assistance: and if these left Alexandria early in November, it was probably at the most critical period of the contest. Nor is it improbable that the night on which they were intercepted was that of the full moon of December, or just before it, December 7 or 8.

It is observable also that at this conjuncture of the defeat of Domitius by Pharnaces the Auctor De Bello digresses to give an account of what happened, at the same time, (Sub idem tempus,) in Illyricum [d], and also in Spain [e]; from which

* It appears from Dio, xlii. 43, that when Cæsar left the port of Alexandria, before this decisive battle, it was by night, and with a great number of lights hanging from the prows of his ships; which were extinguished as soon as they had answered the purpose of deceiving the enemy. We strongly suspect from this fact that there was a moon, that night, but not much before midnight. The moon was new December 23, and that moon would be rising a little before midnight, January 9 or 10.

[y] De Bello Alex. 25. Cf. 23: 4. Dio, xlii. 42.
[z] De Bello Alex. 34. Dio, xlii. 9: 45: 46.
[a] De Bello Alex. 35–37.
[b] Ibid. 38—41.
[c] Ibid. 38. Appian, Mithridatica, cxx. B. C. ii. 91.
[d] De Bello Alex. 42—47.
[e] Ibid. 48–64. Livy, cxi.

we must conclude that these events were more or less simultaneous, and all happened about the time of this defeat of Domitius by Pharnaces. If the date of this latter was really about the 10th of December B. C. 48, then at the ordinary rate of the transmission of news from Asia to Rome, at this period, and in the winter season [f], it could not be known of at Rome in less than 3 or 4 months' time. There is a reference to all these misfortunes in common, in an epistle of Cicero's [g], dated iii Nonas Junias, March 20 B. C. 47; which proves that all were known of in Italy by that time, but evidently had not long been so: Cum ea plaga in Asia sit accepta [h], in Illyrico [h], in Cassiano negotio [e], in ipsa Alexandria [i], in urbe [l], in Italia [m].

It appears also to be implied in Dio [n] that Cæsar undertook to mediate between Cleopatra and Ptolemy, after his arrival in Egypt, in quality of Dictator; but we have his own assurance that he did so in the capacity of Consul [o]: nor could he have done so at that time in any other, as he was not elected dictator the second time until the end of U. C. 706 [p]; though it is possible (or rather highly probable) that he would hear of his second election to the dictatorship soon after the close of the Alexandrine war, B. C. 47; and might mediate as dictator between Cleopatra and Arsinoë her sister [q].

But Dio falls into a mistake, in supposing that this second dictatorship was both offered to Cæsar and accepted by him, and Antony also nominated his master of the horse a second time, U. C. 706 [r]. Antony indeed did not accompany him to Asia after Pharsalia; but was sent back to Italy, to take the charge of things there again as he had done before. We learn that from Cicero himself [s]. He was in Italy viii Idus Martias [t] U. C. 707 December 24 B. C. 48, and xii Kalendas Quinctiles [u] April 5 B. C. 47; and no doubt at both those

[f] Cf. our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. i. 306: iii. 382.
[g] Ad Attic. xi. 16.
[h] Cf. Suetonius, Julius Cæs. xxxvi. 1.
[i] De Bello Alex. 19—21. Dio, xlii. 37—39.
[l] Dio, xlii. 26—33. Appian, B. C. ii. 92. Livy, cxiii. Ad Attic. xi. 23. De Bello Alex. 65.
[m] Ad Attic. x. 10. Cf. Livy, cxi. Dio, xlii. 22—25. Velleius Pat. ii. 68.
[n] xlii. 35.
[o] De Bello Civ. iii. 107: 108.
[p] Dio, xlii. 20. Livy, cxii.
[q] De Bello Alex. 33.
[r] xlii. 21.
[s] Philippica, ii. 24, 59: 57.
[t] Ad Attic. xi. 12. Cf. Livy, cxiii.
[u] Ad Attic. xi. 18.

times exercising the powers of the Magister Equitum: for which however, if Cicero is to be believed [w], he was indebted to the nomination not of Cæsar, (then absent,) but of Cæsar's friends. And this may serve to explain the misstatement of Plutarch [x]; who supposes Cæsar to have been declared dictator a second time immediately after Pharsalia, and Antony at the same time nominated master of the knights, and sent back to Italy: though, very inconsistently with that supposition yet much nearer to the truth, in his life of Cæsar [y] he dates even Cæsar's appointment only the next year, in the course of which he returned from Egypt.

With regard to the letters of Cicero, for this period, which have not yet been mentioned; we trace them down to iii Nonas Januarias [z] U. C. 707, October 24 B. C. 48, and to xii Kalendas Februarias [a] November 9, and to the viii Idus Martias [b] December 24: before we meet with any allusion to Alexandria, or to Cæsar as there. The first in which such an allusion occurs is without a date [c]; P. Lentulum patrem Rhodi esse aiunt, Alexandriæ filium*: Rhodoque Alexandriam Caium Cassium profectum esse constat: which last assertion is contradicted in a letter dated Pridie Idus Maii [d] February 28 B. C. 47: C. quidem Cassium aiunt consilium Alexandriam eundi mutavisse. And at this time Cæsar himself was known or supposed to be there: Ille enim ita videtur Alexandriam tenere ut eum scribere etiam pudeat de illis rebus [d]. The war was already at an end, and no doubt known to be so; yet no letters had yet been received from Cæsar himself up to this date of February 28, B. C. 47. By the time of the next letter [e], iii Nonas Junias March 20, as we have seen, more was known; and Cæsar's return must have begun to be expected, since Cicero writes in it thus:

* These two Lentuli, the father and the son, were Cicero's personal friends. P. Lentulus was consul U. C. 697 B. C. 57. The first book of Cicero's letters, Ad Familiares, is addressed to him: cf. Ad. Fam. xii. 14. Brutus, 77, 268. L. Lentulus was consul U. C. 705 B. C. 50–49. He perished at Alexandria, along with Pompey: Cæsar, De Bello Civ. iii. 104. Cicero, Ad Fam. ix. 18. Plutarch, Pompeius, lxxx.

[w] Philippica, ii. 25, 62.
[x] Antonius, viii.
[y] Cap. li.
[z] Ad Attic. xi. 9.
[a] Ibid. 10.
[b] Ibid. 11: 12: cf. 16.
[c] Ad Attic. xi. 13.
[d] Ibid. 15.
[e] Ibid. 16.

De obviam itione ita faciam ut suades; neque enim valde de adventu ejus opinio est, neque si qui ex Asia veniunt quidquam auditum esse dicunt de pace.

ii. *On the chronology of the war with Pharnaces. Date of the arrival of Cæsar at Antioch.*

This brings us however to the consideration of the chronology of the war with Pharnaces; preliminary to which we must endeavour to ascertain the date of Cæsar's departure from Egypt: and that of his arrival at Antioch.

According to Appian[f] he was nine months in Egypt upon this occasion; from B. C. 48–B. C. 47: and he could not have been much less if, as Plutarch informs us[g], Cleopatra was delivered of a son (Cæsario) by him, soon after his departure. It appears too from Suetonius[h] that, for one reason or another, he must have prolonged his stay in Egypt a good while even after the war was over. Now he arrived July 27 B. C. 48, October 3 Roman U. C. 706; and if he stayed only eight months complete after that he could not have left it again before the Kalends of June U. C. 707, March 18 B. C. 47: but he might do so on that very day; and yet would have stayed sufficiently long previously to justify Appian in saying that he was nine months there in all: for nine months would be the number from October Roman U. C. 706 to June Roman U. C. 707, each reckoned inclusively.

We collect from the letters of Cicero that nothing had as yet been heard at Brundisium of the fact of his departure by the (xviii) xvii Kalendas Quinctiles[i], March 31 B. C. 47; though a certain Sallustius, mentioned in the same letter, was then proposing to go to him, and Cicero was thinking of sending Cicero his son along with him: and this Sallustius was afterwards actually at Antioch when Cæsar also was there[k]. Nor had any thing yet been heard of it by the xii Kalendas Quinctiles[l], April 5; for which reason Cicero had now changed his mind about sending his son. Nor yet

[f] B. C. ii. 90.

[g] Cæsar, xlix. Cf. Antonius, liv. lxxxi: lxxxii. Cf. Dio, xlvii. 31.

[h] Vita, lii. 1—4. Cf Appian, B. C. ii. 90.

[i] Ad Attic. xi. 17. Cf. Ad Fam. xiv. 11 to Terentia, written the same day.

[k] Ad Attic. xi. 20.

[l] Ibid. 18. Cf. Ad Fam. xiv. 15 to Terentia.

on the vii and vi Idus Quinctiles[m], April 24 and 25; if those letters to Terentia were written on those days.

There is however a letter to Atticus[n] in which, though it is itself without a date, the following statement occurs: Acusius quidam Rhodo venerat iix Idus Quinctiles (April 23). is nuntiabat Quintum filium ad Cæsarem profectum iv Kalendas Junias (March 15). Philotimum Rhodum pridie eum diem (March 14) venisse, habere ad me litteras.

This Acusius might easily have come from Rhodes to Brundisium between March 15 and April 23; which would allow 39 days for the passage. If Quintus the younger set out to go to Cæsar, on March 15, he must have set out for Antioch; for he met Cæsar at last at Antioch[o]. It must therefore have been known at Rhodes on March 15 B. C. 47 that Cæsar was shortly to be expected at Antioch. And Quintus might have learnt that from Philotimus, who arrived at Rhodes on March 14; for Philotimus was a freedman of Cicero's[p], whom he himself had probably some time before sent to Egypt. He must at least have been in Egypt, and have been charged with letters to Cicero from Cæsar himself in Egypt; and in all probability he had come straight from Egypt to Rhodes on this occasion, and had left the port of Alexandria for that purpose only a few days before March 14. Cæsar then was still in Egypt a few days before March 14; and yet was expected to be in Antioch soon after March 15: which agrees wonderfully with our conclusion that he actually left Egypt on March 18.

And with respect to the arrival of these letters, of which Philotimus was the bearer; Cicero wrote to Atticus on the xi Kalendas Sextiles[q] May 7: Philotimus dicitur Idibus Sextilibus (sc. adfuturus) May 29: nihil habeo de illo amplius. On the viii Idus Sextiles[r], May 22, he speaks of his having been seen at Ephesus. Nor had he yet arrived on the iii Idus Sextiles[s], May 27, when he wrote to Terentia;

[m] Ad Fam. xiv. 10: 13. Cf. 19.
[n] xi. 23.
[o] Ad Attic. xi. 20.
[p] Cf. Ad Attic. ii. 4: iv. 10: v. 8: 17: 19: vi. 1: 3: vii. 3: vii. 19: 22: 23: viii. 16: ix. 5: 7: 9: x. 8: 9: 11: 15: xi. 16: 19: 23: 24: xii. 5: 7: 44: xiii. 33: xvi. 1: 3: 11: Ad Fam. iv. 2: viii. 3: xiv. 18: 24. Ad Quint. Fr. iii. 1.
[q] xi. 19.
[r] xi. 24.
[s] Ad Fam. xiv. 24.

though, as a letter written Prīdie Idus Sextiles[t], May 28, informs her, he actually came on that day and with the letters to Cicero of which he was said to be the bearer. Consequently as nearly as possible on the very day on which he first told Atticus[q] he might be expected.

Lastly there is a letter to Atticus[u], dated on the iii Nonas Quinctiles April 20 B. C. 47, in which he observes to him: Illum discessisse Alexandria rumor est non firmus, ortus ex Sulpicii litteris: quas cuncti postea nuntii confirmarunt. And if he actually left Alexandria on the Kalends of June, March 18, this fact might already be known at Brundisium 33 days after that date: i. e. by April 20.

These different testimonies then conspire to one result; viz. that such must have been the actual date of the departure. If we turn to the account of proceedings, subsequent to the pacification of Egypt, given by the Auctor De Bello; it appears that leaving the rest of his soldiers behind, but taking the sixth legion with him, Cæsar set out by land: Ipse itinere terrestri profectus est in Syriam[w]. It appears too that while on the road to Syria he stayed some time more or less Fere in omnibus civitatibus quæ majore (erant) dignitate; awarding Præmia bene meritis et viritim et publice[x]: so that, though he might possibly have marched more or less every day, the rate of his march on the whole could not have been more than an army might easily maintain even for a considerable length of time.

Now the distance from Alexandria in Egypt to Antioch in Syria by land was not less than 660 Roman miles direct, 740 by road; and that would require 43 days' march at the rate of 17 miles a day: so that if he did not leave Egypt before March 18 he could not have been at Antioch before April 29 (Pridie Idus Quinctiles U. C. 707). And as the Auctor De Bello[y] tells us that he stayed only a few days in Syria (meaning probably Antioch)—if he arrived there on April 28 or 29, he might still have left it again by May 1 or 2. Now there is a

[t] Ibid. 23. Cf. Oratio xli, Pro Ligario, 3, 7: Oratio xlii, Pro Rege Dejotaro, 14, 38.

[u] xi. 25.

[w] Cap. 33. 69. Cf. Suetonius, Julius, lxxvi. 10: xxxv. 3. Josephus, Ant. Jud. xiv. viii. 3 supposes him to set out by sea. Cf. however De Bello, i. ix. 5: x. 4.

[x] Cap. 65. Cf. Dio, xlii. 49.

[y] Cap. 66. Cf. Dio, xlvii. 26.

letter of Cicero's to Atticus[z] dated on the xvi Kalendas Septembres (May 31) which begins as follows: Septimo decimo Kal. Sept. (May 30) venerat die xxiix Seleucia Pieria C. Trebonius, is qui se Antiochiæ diceret apud Cæsarem vidisse Quintum filium cum Hirtio. Trebonius therefore had left Seleucia on May 3: and though it does not follow from this fact that Cæsar must have been still at Antioch when *he* was setting sail from Seleucia; it must follow from it that he had been there on or before May 2: and that would be entirely consistent with our conclusion, that he probably arrived there on April 28 or 29, and left it again on or before May 2. Seleucia was only 120 stades distant from Antioch; and on the same river, (the Orontes,) nearer to the sea[a]: and one, who was in Antioch any time between April 28 and May 3, might easily set sail from Seleucia on May 3.

iii. *On the date of the battle of Zela.*

The truth indeed appears to be that Cæsar made a very short stay any where, in the course of this march of his through Syria, because he was anxious to arrive as speedily as possible at that part of Asia where his presence was most urgently required, the scene of the war with Pharnaces[b]. And for this reason, it may be collected that instead of holding his principal *conventus* at Antioch in Syria he had determined to hold it at Tarsus in Cilicia, which was so far on his way; and with that object in view he had already given notice to the different states of Asia that they were to meet him at Tarsus: though the Auctor De Bello[c] supposes that to have been done only after his arrival there in person; which we may undertake to say would have been impossible, for want of time. It is a proof of the despatch which he was using in this part of his journey that he went to Tarsus from Antioch by sea; on board the same fleet which had originally accompanied him to Egypt[d]. In which case, he would reach his destination in considerably less than one day's sail. With regard then to the actual time of his arrival at Tarsus, and

[z] xi. 20. Cf. 21.

[a] Cf. D'Anville, i. 385: also our Dissertations on the Principles, &c. iv. 529, note.

[b] De Bello Alex. 65. Suetonius, Julius, XXXV.

[c] De Bello Alex. 66.

[d] De Bello Civ. iii. 106: De Bello Alex. 66. Cf. Josephus, supra, p. 497.

consequently of his departure from the mouth of the Orontes; it may be best collected from the account of his movements after he left it again, down to the date of the battle of Zela. His route from Tarsus to Zela is described by the Auctor De Bello[e]; nor does it appear from this description that he stayed any where on the road, except for two days at Mazaca in Cappadocia, (afterwards called Cæsarea). And the rest of his march was a forced one; performed Magnis itineribus[f].

Now the distance from Tarsus to the scene of the battle with Pharnaces[g] was 170 Roman miles direct, 190 by road; eight days' march at the rate of 23 or 24 miles a day. Add to these the *Biduum* passed at Mazaca. Ten days at least would be necessary to take him from Tarsus to Zela. The date of the arrival at Zela is known. Ab Alexandria, says Suetonius[h], in Syriam et inde Pontum transivit...Pharnacem ...intra *quintum* quam adfuerat diem, quatuor quibus in conspectum venit horis, una profligavit acie. The Amiternine calendar supplies the Roman date of the victory, iv Nonas Sextiles, May 18 B. C. 47. It follows that Cæsar must have arrived on May 14; and must have defeated Pharnaces on the *fifth* day after, May 18*.

* For the rest of the history of Pharnaces see Appian, Mithridatica, 120, 121: Dio, xlii. 46, 47. He was killed by Asander, a rebellious Satrap; as Dio implies B. C. 48. Cf. liv. 24, B. C. 14. And this would seem to have been the date of his death according to Appian also; who supposes him to have reigned 15 years. But if these 15 years bore date from B. C. 63, the year of the death of Mithridates, that would imply that he died before the battle of Zela; B. C. 48. Either then he reigned 16 years at least, from his father's death, or his reign is to be dated not from his father's death in B. C. 63, but from his confirmation in the kingdom by Pompey, B. C. 62: see Mithridatica, 110–113: B. C. ii. 92: Dio, xxxvii. 12–14. But, even in this case, he must have been killed, B. C. 47, not long after the battle of Zela, May 18 that year.

[e] De Bello Alex. 66–72. Cf. Pliny, H. N. vi. 4.

[f] Cap. 66.

[g] Mithridatica, 120, Appian calls this the Σκότιον ὄρος. Ibid. 89: it was there that Mithridates defeated Triarius, B. C. 67. Cf. Dio, xxxv. 10. 12. 13: xxxvi 21: xlii. 48. Pliny, H. N. vi. 4. Plutarch, Lucullus, xxxv.

[h] Vita, xxxv. 3: cf. Dio, xlii. 47, 48: xliv. 46. Appian, B. C. ii. 91. Livy, cxiii. Plutarch, Cæsar, l. Cicero, Ad Fam. xiii. 29. Oratio xlii Pro Rege Dejotaro, 5, 14. De Divinatione, i. 15, 27: ii. 37, 79. Dejotarus was present assisting Cæsar on this occasion.

It is true that in the account of the Auctor De Bello[i] one day and one night only are specified; which must have been May 17 and the night of that day: but even he shews that there was some interval, more or less, after the arrival of Cæsar, occupied by negotiations between him and Pharnaces[h]; whose object thereby was to gain time. Appian also mentions these negotiations; which he supposes to have begun when Cæsar was still 200 stades distant from Pharnaces[i]. The time actually so taken up must have been Suetonius' *four* days, between the arrival, May 14, and the battle, May 18. Meanwhile, it is one confirmation of the traditionary date of the battle that, even to judge from the context of the Auctor De Bello[k], the night before the battle must have been totally dark; and that could not fail to be the case: for the moon was new May 20 or 21, only three days after the battle.

So far then all is consistent. Cæsar, having arrived at Zela on the tenth day from Tarsus, yet on May 14, must have left Tarsus on May 5. If then he was at Antioch on April 28, and yet had held his conventus at Tarsus, and despatched all his business there, by May 4 inclusive; this must render it extremely probable that he actually arrived at Tarsus, and consequently left Antioch, on May 1.

iv. *On the date of the* Αὐτονομία *of Antioch.*

And this conclusion may be confirmed in the last place by the date of the publication of the Αὐτονομία of Antioch; on the explanation and illustration of which we shall not enter at present, because it belongs to a different part of our subject. We will observe only that it was the 20th of Artemisius in the calendar of Antioch for the time being, and the 12th of May B. C. 47. It is not to be inferred from the account of the circumstances of this publication either in John of Antioch commonly called Malela, or in the Chronicon Paschale, that it took place before the arrival of Cæsar at Antioch, or while he was still there; but on the contrary, in his absence, and after he had been there.

[i] Cap. 73, 74-76, 77.
[h] Ib. 69-71.
[i] B. C. ii. 91; cf. Dio, xlii. 47: xliv. 46.
[k] Cap. 73, 74.

Now the distance of Tarsus from Antioch by land was seven days' journey, at the rate of 22 miles a day. If then the decree of Cæsar, which conferred this privilege of the Autonomy, was despatched from Tarsus on the last day on which it could have been sent from thence, May 5, it would reach Antioch on May 12, Artemisius 20; as Malela and the Paschal Chronicle attest that it did: and its publication, three days after, as they also imply, would take place May 15 Artemisius 23. The Æra of Antioch properly so called, (as it is well known,) was dated from this concession of the Autonomy in question; yet not from the year of the concession itself U. C. 707 B. C. 47, but two years earlier, U. C. 705 B. C. 49, *ex auctumnô*: i. e. from the month of Hyperberetæus, in the proper calendar of Antioch at the time. And for this peculiarity too of the reckoning of the æra we have assigned a probable reason, supra[1]; viz. that it was purposely fixed to the same epoch as that of the first dictatorship of Julius Cæsar, and consequently that of the first communication of those extraordinary powers by virtue of which he was entitled to make even such concessions as these. It should be remembered that he was now dictator the second time, and had made this very concession in that capacity. The Antiochenes would look on this second dictatura as merely a continuation of the first; and therefore would naturally go back to the epoch of the first, if they must connect the æra of their own Autonomia with either: not to that of the second.

v. *On the date of the arrival of Cæsar in Italy*, B. C. 47.

After the coincidences which have thus been pointed out, nothing more can require to be said in illustration of the calendar dates of the present year. We shall conclude with a brief consideration of the probable date of Cæsar's final return to Italy, and of Cicero's departure from Brundisium.

The Auctor De Bello observes upon the movements of Cæsar in Asia after the defeat of Pharnaces[m]: Neque tamen usquam diutius moratus est, quam necessitas urbanarum seditionum pati videbatur. rebus felicissime celerrimeque confectis in Italiam celerius omnium opinione venit. But, for the

[1] Page 460.

[m] Cap. 78 ad fin. Cf. Dio, xlii. 49.

actual or the probable date of his return thither, we must go to the Epistles of Cicero.

Writing to Atticus on the vi Kalendas Septembres [n], June 10, Cicero observes: Ille ad Kalendas Septembres (June 15) Athenis non videtur fore. multa eum in Asia dicuntur morari, maxime Pharnaces: so that the defeat of Pharnaces on May 18 had not yet been heard of even at Brundisium by June 10 [o]: which was very possible. There is next a short letter to Terentia [p] of the Kalends of September, June 15; and when that was written he seems to have been expecting a communication of some kind or other from Cæsar, which would determine his own proceedings. There is another [q], a month later, i. e. of the Kalends of October, July 14; written De Venusino: and he was then returning home, and he tells Terentia to expect him on the Nones or on the day after, July 20 or 21.

We may infer then that Cæsar arrived between June 15 and July 14, probably not long before the latter day; and that Cicero and he had had an interview, in which the latter had given him leave to remove from Brundisium. Plutarch tells us Cæsar landed at Tarentum, and came thence to Brundisium on foot; and that Cicero met him on the way [r]. It is not probable that after remaining at Brundisium so long he would venture to leave it at last without the permission of Cæsar. If then he was already there before Pridie Nonas Novembres [s] U. C. 706, August 28 B. C. 48, and still there down to the Kalends of October U. C. 707, July 14 B. C. 47, or a little before it; his entire sojourn in that city could not have been much less than eleven months: and we need not wonder at the frequent complaints which he makes to Atticus of the irksomeness of the interval so passed. The latter part of the time, Sextilis and September Roman, May 17—July 14, in particular must have coincided with the hottest season of the year; and in two of his letters [t], (one dated vi Kal. Sept. June 10, the other without date, but probably written about the same time,) he begins to complain of the injury which his health itself was sustaining from the

[n] xi. 21.
[o] Cf. xi. 22.
[p] Ad Fam. xiv. 22.
[q] Ibid. 20: cf. vi. 6.
[r] Cicero, xxxix.
[s] Ad Fam. xiv. 12.
[t] Ad Attic. xi. 21, 22.

confinement of the place, and from the heat of the weather: Nunc metuo ne sit exspectandum; et cum reliquis etiam loci gravitas hic miserrime perferenda[u]—Pharnaces autem quoquo modo aget adferet moram: quid mihi igitur censes? jam enim corpore vix sustineo gravitatem hujus cœli qui mihi laborem affert in dolore[w].

vi. *On the date of the assumption of the* Toga Virilis *by Augustus Cæsar.*

The proper name of Augustus Cæsar at this time was Caius Octavius Cæpias[x]; and as we are informed by Suetonius[a] that he assumed the toga virilis *four* years (quadriennio) after he was *twelve* years of age, though that might seem to imply that it was assumed either in his 15th year, U. C. 705 B. C. 49, or in his 16th, U. C. 706 B. C. 48; in reality it means after his 16th year, or when he was more than 16 complete.

We learn from Servius[b] that when the young men among the Romans underwent this ceremony it was usual for them to pay a visit to the Capitol, and to the shrine of Jupiter there; and the ancients relate a story respecting some dream of Cicero's, which was verified in a remarkable manner by the appearance to him of the young Augustus himself the next day[c]. If there was any foundation for this story in the matter of fact, in our opinion it must have been something which happened on this occasion; when the youthful Octavius after the assumption of the manly gown paid the usual visit to the Capitol. And this would imply that Cicero also must have been at Rome when Augustus assumed the toga. He was never there however between Dec. 1 B. C. 49 and

[u] Ibid. 21. [w] Ibid. 22.

[x] *Dio*, xlv. 1.

[a] Augustus, viii. 2. Cf. Dio, xlv. 2.

[b] Ad Virg. Eclog. iv. 50. Cf. Suetonius, Claud. ii. 5.

[c] Cf. Plutarch, Cicero, xliv. Suetonius, Aug. xliv. 16. Tertullian, iv. 308: De Anima, 46. Q. Catulus is mixed up with this story, as Cicero was with the other, noticed supra, in reference to the Horoscope of Augustus: p. 354. From Dio, xlv. 2, it may be considered just possible that Catulus might have seen Augustus; but only as a child, two or three years old. All these illustrious characters, Catulus, Hortensius, Lucullus, &c. were dead, before the civil war broke out: Vell. Pat. ii. 49. Catulus, according to Dio, (xxxvii. 46,) died B. C. 61. He was living B. C. 62, in the year of Cæsar's Prætura: Suetonius, Julius, xiv. 1: xv. 1. Cicero, Ad Attic. ii. 24. Cf. also Dio, xxxvii. 37: 44: (cf. xliii. 14.) Vell. Pat. ii. 43. Cicero, xxxii. Pro Sextio, 57, 122: 47, 101: xxxiv. Pro M. Cœlio, 24, 59: xxxv. De Provin. 2, 21. Catulus was dead when Cicero wrote Ad Attic. i. 20, B. C. 60.

July 14 B. C. 47 at least. Augustus consequently could not have assumed the toga any time in B. C. 48. Nicolaus of Damascus therefore was mistaken[d] in saying that he assumed it at about 14 years of age; and at the same time was elected Pontiff in the room of L. Domitius. This latter statement indeed might be correct; for Domitius was one of those who fell in the battle of Pharsalia[e], B. C. 48: but the former could not be so, if there is any truth in the other story, above referred to. The Antiatine calendar supplies the day of the assumption, xv Kal. Nov. October 18 Roman; and, if the year was U. C. 707 B. C. 47, Cicero might then have been at Rome; for the Julian date of this Roman one was July 31. It is observable that U. C. 707 October 18 Roman was not Nundinal. It is manifest on this principle, that Augustus was assuming the manly gown at 16 complete; i. e. in his 17th year: for October 18 was 24 days later than his 17th birth-day, September 23 previously.

vii. *On the date of the Decree in Josephus, of the Ides of December*, B. C. 47.

Lastly, a decree is extant in Josephus[f], which as it stands in his text at present is dated simply on the Ides of December; purporting to have been passed at Rome in some year on that day, in the Temple of Concord, and under the auspices of Lucius Valerius, designated as Prætor. Josephus himself supposes it to have been passed at Rome on this day in obedience to some orders of Cæsar to that effect, sent from Syria[g]; and in reward of services rendered him by Hyrcanus and Antipater: which, if true, would fix its date to the Ides of December, B. C. 47. To this supposition however one great objection would be that, before the Ides of December, B. C. 47, Cæsar himself was at Rome again, and no longer in the east. Another would be that B. C. 47 the

d Vita, iv.

e De Bello Civ. iii. 99. Cicero, Philippica, ii. 29, 71. Suetonius, Nero, iii. 6. Appian, B. C. ii. 82. Tacitus, Ann. iv. 44. Cn. Domitius his son, survived: see Suetonius, Nero, iii. 1. Vell. Pat. ii. 72: 76: 84. Cicero, Philippica, ii. 11, 27: Ad Fam. vi. 22. Of the alternation of the Prænomina, Caius and Lucius, in the Gens Domitia, see Suetonius, Nero, i. 5, 6. Octavius Cæsar is recognized as Pontiff at the beginning of B. C. 43: Philippica, v. 17, 46. Cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 59.

f Ant. Jud. xiv. viii. 5. Cf. xvii. ii. 4. p. 646: Bell. i. x. 3.

g Ant. Jud. xiv. viii. 4, 5.

Ides of December fell on Sept. 24; and, the Dom. Letter of the year being B. September 24 was a Saturday: and this edict in favour of the Jews, and passed no doubt with their own concurrence and cooperation, on that principle must have been passed on the *Sabbath day*.

But the truth is that, if we compare the First book of Maccabees[h] with this edict, there will be no hesitation in concluding that the decree here recited is the answer of the Roman senate to the embassy first of Jonathan, and again of Simon, the second and third of the Maccabean princes, there recorded. The shield of gold, and the names of the ambassadors, Numenius and Alexander (corrige Antipater), identify one with the other. Lucius too is mentioned by name in the first of Maccabees[i]; only that he is there styled Lucius the Consul, not Lucius the Prætor. Now this embassy returned home Æra 174[k] B. C. 138. The decree consequently was passed on the Ides of December, U. C. 615; Period iii. 22 of the Irregular calendar: January 9 B. C. 138. The Dom. Letter of that year was D, and Jan. 9 was a *Friday*. The consuls of the year were Cn. Calpurnius Piso M. Popillius Lænas; and they might both be absent from Rome on that day: though even while they were there the prætor Urbanus would have been competent to preside at an audience of an embassy from abroad, on such an occasion as this. Thus we see that the true date of the decree, instead of militating against the Hebdomadal cycle of our Fasti, as the false date assigned it by Josephus appeared to do, does in reality confirm it.

SECTION VI.—*Irregular Calendar, Cycle* vii. 19. 445 *days*.

U. C. 708 Varr. 707 Cap. 705 Polyb. B. C. 47–46.

C. Julius Cæsar iii
M. Aimilius Lepidus.

Kalendæ Januariæ Oct. 11 B. C. 47. Nundinal Char. 6.

The course of our investigations has now conducted us down to U. C. 708 of Varro, the last year of the Irregular

[h] Chap. xii. 1. 3. 16: xiv. 22. 24: xv. 15—21. [i] xv. 16. [k] xv. 10. 15.

Roman calendar, and ultimately the link of connection between the old Roman reckoning of noctidiurnal and annual time, and the Julian or the Gregorian, as it is in use at present. We say *ultimately;* for the proximate link of connection between them, as we hope to shew hereafter, was A. D. 224 *ex Kalendis Martiis.*

Chronologers have usually given this year the name of the year of *confusion;* yet such an appellation cannot be considered to be justly applicable to it: at least if it is to be understood thereby that this year was in itself a source of confusion of any kind, and not rather a means and an instrument of putting a stop to and of rectifying a state of confusion and disorder in the civil reckoning of annual time, which was now of 162 years' standing. We must therefore suppose that this name has been given to it because of its *unusual* length; which far exceeded any just and allowable measure of the civil year, whether solar or lunar: and much more any of the natural.

And this leads us to observe that as the length of this year is known from testimony, and as the Julian date of the Kalends of January in the last year of the Irregular calendar is known also; there can or ought to be no uncertainty about the Julian date of the Kalends of January in the next year, the first year of the Julian æra properly so called. The length of this last year of the Irregular calendar was 445 days. The Kalends of January this year coincided with October 11 B. C. 47. Reckon on 445 days from the Kalends of January U. C. 708 and you must come to the Kalends of January U.C. 709; and reckon on 445 days from October 11 B. C. 47 and you must come to December 30 B. C. 46. If then October 11 was the Julian date of the Kalends of January U. C. 708, December 30 must have been the Julian date of the Kalends of January U. C. 709. If there can be no doubt of the former, there can be no doubt of the latter; and after the proofs and verifications of the whole of this intervening period from B. C. 208 to B. C. 47, which have been adduced and laid before the reader almost year by year, and especially since B. C. 63 in particular, we think we are justified in assuming that there can, or ought to, be *now* no doubt about the former.

It follows then that the true Julian date of the first Kalends of January in the Julian year, as bearing date from the correction of the calendar by Julius Cæsar, was not, as chronologers without exception, so far as we know, have uniformly taken it for granted, the first of January B.C. 45, but, as we ourselves have repeatedly asserted in former parts of these Fasti Catholici and Origines Kalendariæ of ours[l], and as we have always undertaken to prove at the proper time, and (as we thank God) we have at last succeeded in proving, December 30 B.C. 46. The importance of this discovery is self-evident. We shall not however stop at present to point out the consequences which necessarily flow from it. The year of confusion may be regarded as the last in the irregular administration of the Roman calendar; and considered in that point of view and in that relation it would demand a place in the present cycle. But it is also so closely connected with the Julian correction, that it may perhaps with still greater propriety be reserved until that subject comes under our consideration.

i. *On the Chronology of the* Bellum Africanum. *Date of the passage to Africa.*

We shall however briefly review the chronology of the first part of this year, down to the time of the correction; which was one of the last events of the year, coming between the months of October and December Roman. And of the first half of this consular year the principal event was the Bellum Africanum of Julius Cæsar.

The author of the history of this war, (whether it was Hirtius or some other of the contemporaries and followers of Cæsar,) dates his arrival at Lilybæum, (from which quarter he put to sea,) on the xiiii Kal. Januarias[m]: Cæsar itineribus justis confectis nullo die intermisso a. d. xiiii Kal. Jan. Lilybæum pervenit, statimque ostendit sese naves velle ascendere . . . tabernaculum secundum litus ipsum constituit, ut prope fluctus verberaret. hoc eo consilio fecit ne quis sibi moræ quidquam fore speraret, et ut omnes in dies horasque parati essent.

[l] See i. 442. Diss. vi. ch. iii. sect. iii, &c.

[m] Cap. i: cf. Appian, B.C. ii. 95.

We may make the same observation on this date as on that of the departure from the city and of the passage from Brundisium before Pharsalia[n]. The actions of Cæsar were distinguished by a boldness and decision, characteristic of himself; and though at first sight such as might be mistaken for rashness they were in reality the dictate of wisdom and foresight, and never other than the necessity of the case both required and justified. In this instance however, as in the former, the misconstruction put upon them by posterity is probably chargeable on the same ambiguity of the Roman date, and on the same ignorance of the relation of the civil to the natural year, as before. Cicero, his contemporary, who could not be unaware of the truth on either of these points, appeals to his conduct in crossing the sea from Sicily to Africa, apparently so late in the year, as a proof of his superiority merely to the prejudices of superstition; not of his contempt of the ordinary rules of military prudence and precaution. Quid? ipse Cæsar cum a summo Haruspice moneretur ne in Africam ante brumam transmitteret nonne transmisit? quod ni fecisset uno in loco omnes adversariorum copiæ convenissent[o]. Plutarch, on the other hand, in dating his departure from Rome to Sicily Περὶ τροπὰς χειμερινὰς[p], and Dio, in dating the passage to Africa Τοῦ χειμῶνος μεσοῦντος[q], must have been misled by the literal construction of the nominal Roman date of each of those events. And yet in reality Cæsar was not braving the season and the elements in proposing to take the field at this time. He was doing no more than the most cautious general might have thought of doing. The Julian date of the xiiii Kalendas Januarias, December 17 Roman U. C. 707, was merely September 28 B. C. 47. And that could not be considered too late either for crossing the sea from Sicily to Africa, or for taking the field there, even in the present year. The date itself however is observable on two accounts. First it was only three days later than the autumnal equinox, September 25 or 26; and secondly it was only two days before the

[n] Supra, 462.

[o] De Divinatione, ii. 24, 52. Cf. Cyprian, De Idolorum Vanitate, iii. 6: Minucius Felix, xxvi. 3.

[p] Cæsar, lii.

[q] xlii. 56: 58: xliii. 4. 6. At this last time, the season was truly more advanced, and nearer to winter.

full moon, September 30. It is clear from the context that Cæsar expected to be detained some time before he could put to sea; and that he pitched his tent so near to the water's edge in order to shew that he was waiting to take advantage of the first opportunity for embarking. The equinox, he knew, was arrived, but its effect on the weather was not yet over. Accordingly the Auctor De Bello continues[r]: Incidit per id tempus ut tempestates ad navigandum idoneas non haberet: nihilo tamen minus in navibus remiges militesque continere, et nullam prætermittere occasionem profectionis. We may reasonably suppose that though he expected to be detained a few days yet he hoped to be able to make the voyage soon after the full of the moon, and with the advantage of light by night as well as by day.

Accordingly though thus detained by the weather *eight* days he set out at last on the vi Kal. Jan[s]. October 6; *nine* days at least before the change of the moon, October 15 or 16: he made the continent of Africa Post diem quartum[t], October 9 (iii Kal. Jan.): he landed at Adrumetum the same day, as the context implies towards evening[t]: and finally moved from thence to Ruspina (12 Roman miles distant from Adrumetum) on the Kalends of January[u] U.C. 708 Oct. 11 B. C. 47. Here too he encamped; and on this locality, and on those in the neighbourhood[w], almost all the ensuing events of this war in Africa appear to have been transacted.

The next date which occurs in terms is iii Nonas Januarias[x], October 13. By that time Cæsar had moved from Ruspina to Leptis[y], *six* miles distant. But on this day he marched back to Ruspina[z]. The next date is Pridie Nonas Januarias[a], October 14; further designated as Post diem tertium quam Africam adtigit; which would be consistent, if referred to the encampment at Ruspina on the Kalends of January, October 11. On this day too he gained his first victory over the forces of the opposite party, commanded by

[r] Cap. 1. [s] Ibid. 2.
[t] Cap. 2: 3—5. Cf. Appian, B. C. iii. 95. Dio, xlii. 58.
[u] Cap. 6.
[w] Cf. Dio, xlii. 58. Pliny, H. N. v. 3. 28[2]: Hic oppida libera, Leptis, Adrumetum, Ruspina, Thapsus: each mentioned in the history of this war, in its turn.
[x] Cap. 9. [y] Cap. 7: 9.
[z] Cap. 9, Unde Pridie venerat, i. e. he had marched to Leptis from Ruspina only the day before, October 12.
[a] Cap. 12—19.

Labienus [b], Petreius, and Piso [c]. It must therefore be evident that every thing related between the return to Ruspina [z], October 13, and this battle [a], October 14, was comprehended in one day and one night, October 13 and the night of October 13. And this night must have been that which Cæsar passed In navibus [d]; on the morning of which he was setting out to return to Ruspina Jam cœlo albente, when part of his ships, coming from Sicily with troops on board, were brought by chance to the same quarter [d]. It is hereby implied that there was no moon on the night of October 13. Nor could there have been; for the moon was new October 15.

The next date which occurs in terms is vi Kalendas Februarias [e], November 4: so that all the events between the battle last mentioned and this date [f] must have come between October 14 and November 4. In the course of this interval, an allusion occurs to the season of the year, soon after the junction of Scipio with Petreius and Labienus [g]: (some time between the *third* day after the battle [h], October 16 or 17, and the date of Scipio's arrival from Utica [i], which being 116 Roman miles direct from the scene of action, 130 by road, would probably require eight or nine days' march:) Neque per anni tempus in mari classes sine periculo vagari poterant [i]. And, between October 24 or 25 and November 4, the season must necessarily be spoken of as approaching to winter.

At a still later point of time than this, when Cæsar had now determined to change his plans, and to bring the war to an end the same year, notwithstanding the season; his orders to his legates in Sicily, Allienus and Rabirius Postumus, ran in these terms: Ut sine mora aut ulla excusatione *hiemis* ventorumque quam celerrime exercitus sibi transportaretur [k]. They arrived in Africa on the *fourth* day after they set out from Lilybæum [l]: and that too before the vi Kal. Febr. [m] November 4: yet, as the context implies, only the day before, or the day but one before it. If so they set out about October 31; and Cæsar's orders must have reached them

[b] Cap. 13.
[c] Ibid. 18. Cf. 20: 24.
[d] Cap. 11. Cf. 10: 8.
[e] Cap. 37. [f] Ibid. 20—37.
[g] Ibid. 24: 20–24. [h] Ibid. 20.
[i] Ibid. 24: 20—24: 28: 33.
[k] Ibid. 26. Cf. Dio, xliii. 4: 6.
[l] Cap. 34. cf. Dio, ibid. [m] Ibid. 35–37.

between October 24 and 31 [n]: at which time the lateness of the season and the risks of the voyage might very well have been pleaded as an excuse for not venturing to sea, except in obedience to such peremptory commands from Cæsar himself.

Yet at the very time of their arrival (November 2 or 3), the passage having been made so safely and so speedily, a part of the same transports which had brought this first division of the forces in Sicily was sent back to fetch the rest [o]. The day of this mission seems to have been critically vi Kal. Febr. November 4 itself: and on the morning of the next day (November 5) there is an account of a march of Cæsar's to Ruspina, which began at the third watch [o], that is, at midnight. The moon having been new October 15 would be rising about midnight, November 5.

From this date, November 5 at midnight, we trace the course of events through that day [p], (v Kal. Febr.); and the next [q], iv Kal. Febr. November 6, from morning to sunset [r]; and virtually for the day after, iii Kal. Febr. November 7: the account of the preceding day concluding as follows; Itaque reductis suis copiis in castra *postero* die propius eorum aciem instituit exporrigere munitiones [r]. And there is no reason to doubt but that on the next day, November 7, this must have been done accordingly.

ii. *On the date of the* Signum Vergiliarum confectum, *for the latitude of Ruspina*, B.C. 47.

It is of much importance to note the date thus ascertained, and that the account of proceedings has been brought down to November 7, with an advance of the lines of Cæsar more or less nearer to those of the adverse party. For we are told [s] that he was in the habit of doing this, (i. e. push forward his front closer and closer to the enemy,) every *third* or *fourth* day. Having done it once on November 7, he could not be expected to do it again, agreeably to his rule, before November 10; nor a third time, before November 13.

At this point of time the narrative of the Auctor De Bello digresses into an account of certain proceedings, which passed

[n] Cf. 8: 31: 26: 28.
[o] Cap. 37.
[p] Ibid. 38—40.
[q] Ibid. 41.
[r] Ibid. 42.
[s] Ibid. 47.

elsewhere; and not between Cæsar in person and the opposite party, but between some of his men and some of theirs [t]: and it is clear from the context that between this digression and the resumption of proceedings at Ruspina [u] under Cæsar himself there must have been an interval of several days*: i. e. from November 7 to some other day in the same month later than that.

Now the resumption of the thread of the narrative at Ruspina is ushered in as follows [u]: Per id tempus fere Cæsaris exercitui res accidit incredibilis auditu. namque Virgiliarum signo confecto circiter vigilia secunda noctis nimbus cum saxea grandine subito est coortus ingens. ad hoc autem incommodum accesserat quod Cæsar non more superiorum imperatorum in hibernis exercitum continebat, sed in tertio quartoque die procedendo propiusque hostem accedendo castra communiebat; opereque faciendo milites se circumspiciendi non habebant facultatem ..... itaque subito imbre grandineque consecuta, gravati pondere, tenebris aquaque omnes subruti disjectique, nocte intempesta, ignibus exstinctis rebusque ad victum pertinentibus omnibus corruptis, per castra passim vagabantur, scutisque capita contegebant. eadem nocte quintæ legionis pilorum cacumina sua sponte arserunt.

It was probably no unusual phenomenon, for the climate of this part of Africa, which is here described. The same kind of sudden and unexpected convulsion of the elements, at the same season of the year and in or about the same locality, might be instanced from the accounts of Diodorus. It appears in fact to have been something liable to occur at the breaking up of the dry season, and the setting in of the rainy season, in Africa; a time of the year which the ancients denoted in general by that of the Πλειάδων δύσις or the Vergiliarum occasus matutinus, the cosmical setting of

* Especially as this includes the arrival of the second convoy from Sicily, cap. 44–46. Cæsar sent 6 transports to fetch these, (cap. 37) November 4, as we have seen. They could not have returned at the earliest in less than seven or eight days. If so, from cap. 37 to cap. 46, the interval could not have been less than 7 or 8 days, November 4 to November 11 or 12.

[t] Cap. 43—46. [u] Ibid. 47.

the Pleiads: that is, their setting as the sun was rising. The learned men who have had occasion to consider this incident in the history of the African war of Cæsar for chronological purposes have generally assumed that the natural phenomenon meant in the present instance was this; and some of them have calculated its date, for the latitude and meridian of the ancient Ruspina, B. C. 47: and have determined it to November 10 or 11 [w]. And that, it must be admitted, approaches near to the time to which the course of events, (as they have hitherto passed in review before us,) would seem to fix it.

It has not however occurred to the learned men in question to take notice that the Auctor De Bello does not date this incident Vergiliarum *signo occidente*, or in any manner which would have implied that the setting of the Pleiads was not past; but Vergiliarum *signo confecto*. Now by the *signum confectum* in such cases the ancients did not imply the *article* of the rising or of the setting, whether heliacal, acronychal, or cosmical, but a *certain time after it*. For, as they attributed an ἐπισημασία, an influence upon the weather of some kind or other, to every phenomenon of this description; it was not with the article of the rising or of the setting that the signum or sign was said to be *confectum*, i. e. *completed* or *finished*, but with the transaction of the effect on the weather, the cessation of the ἐπισημασία: and that was not always such as (in their expectation) to be completed in one day, but very often in not less than two or three.

And it must be evident that this is exactly what the Auctor De Bello intended in the present instance. For he speaks of this storm as something extraordinary, as *Res incredibilis auditu*. But none of the ancients would either have thought or have spoken of a storm at the setting of the Pleiads as anything extraordinary. They looked for such storms at that time as matters of course; and were more surprised if they did not occur, than if they did. They were regarded as extraordinary and out of the course of nature only when they were seen to occur after the cause which was supposed to have produced them might be considered to have ceased to operate: i. e. when they fell beyond the limits assigned to the ἐπισημασία,

[w] See the notes to Oudendorp's and Oberlini's Cæsar, in loc.

or to the influence of the sign itself. Nor did they confine this influence to the single day on which the sign rose for the first time, or set for the last, according to the circumstances prescribed; especially in the case of the more remarkable among the signs or constellations, like this of the Pleiads: but they extended it to a day or two before, and to a day or two after *.

We are persuaded then that, whatsoever date of the setting of the Pleiads might have been adopted by the author in question, the storm which he attributed to its influence, but at an irregular time and *signo jam confecto,* could not have occurred less than two or three days later, to make him think and speak of it as something extraordinary. And supposing the actual date of the setting for this latitude and this me-

* Thus Columella, (xi. 1. § 31, 32.) after referring to Virgil's observation, (Georg. i. 204,)

Præterea tam sunt Arcturi sidera nobis,

continues: Contra quam observationem multis argumentis disseruisse me non infitior in iis libris quos adversus astrologos composueram. sed illis disputationibus exigebatur id quod improbissime Chaldæi pollicentur, ut certis quasi terminis ita diebus statis aëris mutationes respondeant: in hac autem ruris disciplina non desideratur ejusmodi scrupulositas; sed quod dicitur pingui Minerva quantumvis utile continget villico tempestatis futuræ præsagium, si persuasum habuerit *modo ante modo post* interdum etiam *stato die* orientis vel occidentis competere vim syderis.

In the Greek language the anticipation of the *ἐπισημασία,* or the arrival of the sensible effect before its time, was termed *προχειμάσαι*: and Festus tells us *Præsidero* was so used in Latin: Præsiderare dicitur cum maturius hiberna tempestas movetur, quasi ante sideris tempus: xlv. 367. 8. The reverse of this, the setting in of the *ἐπισημασία* after its time, in Greek was *μεταχειμάσαι,* and in Latin, according to analogy, it might be supposed would have been Postsiderare: but that word does not occur. Desiderare again, in its first and proper sense, means the same thing as the sidus or signum confectum; cf. Festus, iv. 118. 7. *Considerare,* in like manner, in its first intention too denoted the article of the effect, the *ἐπισημαὶα* in actu. See Festus, iii, 95. 4. Pliny, H. N. xviii. 57. 185: Accedit confessa rerum obscuritas, nunc præcurrente (nec paucis diebus) tempestatum significatu quod *προχείμασιν* Græci vocant; nunc postveniente quod *ἐπιχείμασιν*: et plerumque alias citius alias tardius cœli effectu ad terram deciduo. vulgo serenitate reddita *confectum sidus* audimus — Vegetius, v. 10: Aut enim circa diem statum, aut ante vel postea, tempestates fieri compertum est. unde præcedentes *προχείμασιν,* nascentes die sollemni *ἐπιχείμασιν,* subsequentes *μεταχείμασιν* Græco vocabulo nuncupaverunt.

ridian to have been determined by observation, (as it most probably was,) yet, if the calculation above alluded to is not mistaken, observation itself for this latitude must have determined the phenomenon to November 10 or 11; and therefore the specific effect of the phenomenon, but at an irregular time and *signo jam confecto,* could not have been earlier than November 13 or 14.

And in our opinion its actual date must have been the night of November 13. For first, though it is not distinctly asserted that Cæsar's soldiers had been engaged all the day until night in fortifying their camp before this storm came upon them, it is clearly implied that they had; and that this was the reason why the storm had come upon them unawares: viz. that Opere faciendo se circumspiciendi non habebant facultatem: they were too busy all day to look about them. Again, it was Cæsar's practice at this time to advance his lines every three or four days: and there was a space of three miles between his camp and that of the enemy[x], which allowed him to do that. Now he had advanced his front once before on Nov. 7. It would be repeated Nov. 10; and again Nov. 13: and if it was actually done on this last day, his soldiers might easily have been occupied on the fortification of the camp all the day until the evening; and might then be surprised by the sudden setting in of a change of weather before they were prepared for it. Lastly, the date of the new moon of November, B. C. 47, and for this meridian, was only the day after Nov. 13; and that might have as much to do with the setting in of this storm, and at this particular conjuncture, as any thing else which has yet been mentioned. The new moon of November, B. C. 47, being calculated from our Tables, and for the meridian of Ruspina, (42 m. 58 sec. east of Greenwich,) is found to have fallen November 14 at 11 h. 12 m. 50·9 sec. mean time. These different coincidences, Cæsar's rule in the advance of the front of his camp every three or four days, the setting of the Pleiads, and the limits of the *sidus confectum,* and the new moon for the meridian of Ruspina, all meeting in this one day, November 13, can leave little doubt that November 13 must have been the actual date of this storm, between the second watch, (that is,

[x] Cap. 24.

about 9 P. M.) and midnight. And since it thus appears to have been exactly six days after the last Roman date, which has been given in terms, the iii Kalendas Februarias, November 7, its Roman date must have been the Nones of February U. C. 708. If so, the Nones of February U. C. 708 coincided with November 13.

iii. *On the date of the battle of* Thapsus; *and of the death of Cato.*

The arrival of Juba to the assistance of Scipio and Petreius is mentioned after this[y]; and his coming is attributed to the news of the battle of horse between Cæsar and Scipio[z], in which the latter had the worse. The date of that encounter was the vi Kal. Febr. Nov. 4; the same day on which Cæsar sent back six of his transports, to fetch the rest of his soldiers from Sicily: and there was but one day's interval between the arrival of Juba[a] and that of these reinforcements[b]. It would require eight or ten days to bring them to Africa from Sicily, with whatsoever despatch; so that they could not have arrived before November 13 or 14 at the earliest: and, even as it was, it was some days after their arrival itself before they effected their junction with Cæsar[b].

As to Juba, if he had to march from Cirta[c], (260 miles from Ruspina direct = 290 by road,) and was summoned thence to the aid of Scipio only after November 4, he could scarcely have arrived in less than 30 days' time. But he probably came from Zama[d]: and as that was not more than 80 miles direct from Ruspina, 90 by road, he might both receive the summons of Scipio there, and yet be actually come to Ruspina thence in person, in ten or eleven days' time.

After this we meet with no more dates in terms for some time, though allusions to marches by night or in the morning occur at intermediate points of time; from which an idea of the age of the moon when they were going on might be formed[e]. But the first date which next occurs in terms is the xii Kal. Apriles[f], March 21 Roman January 19 Julian,

[y] Cap. 48. Cf. Dio, xliii. 3: 4—6. Suetonius, Julius, lxvi. 2.

[z] Cf. cap. 37—41. Appian, B. C. ii. 96.

[a] Cap. 48–52.

[b] Ibid. 48: 52: 53: 54. [c] Ibid. 25.

[d] Ibid. 91–94. Cf. Vitruvius, viii. 4.

[e] Cap. 54–74. [f] Ibid. 75.

B. C. 46, when Cæsar performed the ceremony of the lustration of his army; for which we cannot divine any other reason than probably because March was properly the military lustral month, and this day in March, the 21st in particular, was one of the days of the Quinquatrus: viz. the third.

Three days in sequence[g] are mentioned after this, March 22, 23, 24 Roman, January 20, 21, 22 Julian; and on the *fourth* day after the last of the three, March 27 Roman, January 25 Julian, Cæsar marched from his encampment at Tisdra to Agar, where he had once been encamped before[h]: and as that was 52½ miles direct, 58 or 59 by road, from Tisdra[i], (four days' march,) we may presume that he would not get there before March 30 Roman, January 28.

From this day we can follow the course of proceedings without interruption down to the battle of Thapsus, which decided the fortune of this war[k]. The date of this battle, according to Ovid[l] and to the Prænestine calendar, was the viii Idus Apriles, April 6 Roman U. C. 708, February 4 B. C. 46. And this date is confirmed by the testimony of the author De Bello Africano. He mentions Pridie Nonas Apriles[m], February 2; on which day Cæsar set out from Agar Tertia vigilia, i. e. at midnight, and marched to Thapsus, 16 Roman miles. And here it is to be observed that, as the moon was new January 11 or 12, it would be rising about midnight on February 2. Pridie (Nonas) occurs again[n], and of this same day. And then the day after, i. e. the Nones, February 3; and the following night[n]: and on the day after that the battle[o]; thus determined to the viii Idus Apriles, April 6 Roman, February 4 Julian.

It is agreed that the news of the defeat at Thapsus was carried to Utica in three days' time[p], which was possible; the distance not being more than 130 Roman miles direct. It would arrive there consequently April 9 Roman, February 7 Julian. The death of Cato appears to have ensued on the

[g] Cap. 75: 76.
[h] Cf. cap. 67.
[i] Cf. cap. 79.
[k] Ibid. 77—86. Dio, xliii. 7—9. Appian, B. C. ii. 97. Livy, cxiii: cxiv. Plutarch, Cæsar, liii. Cato Min. lvii—lviii. Orosius, vi. 16.
[l] Fasti, iv. 377—380: cf. 373.
[m] Cap. 79.
[n] Ibid. 80: cf. 83.
[o] Cap. 80—86.
[p] Plutarch, Cato Min. lviii. Appian, B. C. ii. 98: 100.

night of the *third* day after[q]; that is, on the night of April 11 or the morning of April 12, February 10 Julian: at 50 years of age according to Appian[r], in his 48th year according to the epitome of Livy[s], and to Plutarch[t]. The context of these accounts would imply that the nights were dark; and Plutarch's in particular that it was the winter season. Both these things were the case February 9 or 10 B. C. 46.

Cæsar himself arrived at Utica after the death of Cato; probably only a day or two later: as he set out on his march thither from the field of Thapsus only the day after his victory[u]; April 7 Roman February 5 Julian. He arrived in the evening[w]: Circiter luminibus accensis: and he passed the night before the gates of Utica. And that too is an argument of a dark night.

iv. *On the date of the return of Cæsar to Rome; and on the dates of his Triumphs*, B. C. 46.

The letters of Cicero give us little or no assistance in fixing the chronology of these events; though several are extant, which must have been written while this war in Africa was going on[x]. We shall notice only one, addressed to Varro[y]; because it appears to have been written after the news of Cæsar's final success had reached the city: and in the midst of the *forty days*' supplications which according to Dio[z] were decreed on that account.

For the account of Cæsar's movements before his return to Italy, we must go to the Auctor De Bello. On the Ides of June, (April 12,) he embarked at Utica; and Post diem tertium (April 14) arrived at Caralis in Sardinia[a]. On the iii Kalendas Quinctiles (April 27) he took ship again from Caralis; and arrived at Rome at last on the *twenty-eighth* day after[a], (May 24, vii Kal. Sextiles,): so long a voyage, from Sardinia merely, being accounted for by his following the line of the coast, and by his having been repeatedly detained by stress of weather on the way.

[q] Auctor De Bello, 87, 88. Plutarch, Cato Min. lix: lxiii: lxv: lxvi: lxvii—lxx. Dio, xliii. 10–13. Appian, B.C. ii. 98: 99. Florus, iv. 2, 70—72.

[r] B. C. ii. 99.

[s] cxiv.

[t] Vita, lxxiii: cf. iii.

[u] Cap. 86.

[w] Ibid. 89, 90.

[x] Cf. Ad Attic. xii. 1—3: 5. Ad Fam. vi. 8.

[y] Ad Fam. ix. 2: cf. 5: 6.

[z] xliii. 14.

[a] Cap. 98; cf. Dio, xliii. 14: 15.

The next thing therefore for our consideration will be the date, or dates, of the triumphs, four in number [b], (a Gallic, an Alexandrine, a Pontic, and an African one respectively,) which it is agreed that he celebrated this year, at Rome; after his return.

Now these triumphs were not celebrated continuously, but Interjectis diebus [c]; and yet they were all celebrated in one month [c]: and it appears from Dio [d] that the date of the last coincided with the day of the dedication of the Forum Cæsaris, and of that of the temple of Venus Genitrix; which Cæsar had vowed on the day of Pharsalia, and which was now ready to be consecrated. Now in the Capranic and the Pincian fragments of the Julian calendar, for the month of September, the stated day of Venus Genitrix appears as the vii Kal. Octobres and as the vi Kalendas Octobres respectively; the former September 25 in the Julian calendar, the latter September 25 in the old calendar: from which we may infer that its true or original date was this of the Pincian fragment, vi Kal. Octobres, and that of the Capranic, the vii Kal. Octobres, was its date after the Julian correction. This explanation seems to be confirmed by the Nundinal character of these two days, B. C. 46: for September 2 Roman, U. C. 708, being Nundinal, September 26 must have been Nundinal; September 25 must have been the day before a Nundinal day. The dedication therefore did not fall on the Nundinal day, but on the day before it. As then Suetonius tells us that these triumphs were all celebrated in one month, and as this of September 25 Roman was the last; they must all have been celebrated in September Roman, between September 1 and 25: and that interval being just 24 days or three periods of eight days each, it is a very probable conjecture that they were all celebrated in the compass of these

[b] Suetonius, Vita xxxvii: cf. lxxviii. 4. Plutarch, Cæsar, lv. Dio, xliii. 15: 19—24. Appian, B. C. ii. 101: 102. Livy, cxv. Velleius Pat. ii. 56 has *five* triumphs; but he includes that of B. C. 45, after Munda. And this may possibly explain his dating them all in the month of October: which might be true of the triumph of B. C. 45. Yet he too makes the Gallic triumph the first of all. Florus, on the other hand, has five triumphs, all after Munda, B. C. 45: iv. 2, 88: 89. They were all indeed celebrated in the month of September.

[c] Suetonius, Julius, xxxvii. 1. Dio, xliii. 19—24.

[d] xliii. 22: cf. Appian, B. C. ii. 102 (68: 69: 75:) iii. 28. Dio, xliii. 43. Servius Ad Æn. vii. 637: cf. Vol. ii. 109. xxxiii.

24 days, eight days asunder one from another; the first September 1 (Roman) June 28, the second September 9 July 6, the third September 17 July 14, and the fourth September 25 July 22: each on the day before the Nundinal day alike. We may confirm this conjecture as follows:

i. It may be inferred from Dio[e] that the night of the last day's triumph was light, immediately after supper at least; and as the moon was new July 8, the night of July 22 was the full moon itself.

ii. Both he and Suetonius[f] inform us that on the day of the first triumph, (the Gallic one,) June 28 as we have concluded, Cæsar's car broke down as he was passing by the Velabrum; and having been detained by that accident he had to mount to the Capitol at last in the *dark*, i. e. *Ad lumina*: with forty elephants carrying lychnuchi for the purpose. There was no moon then we may presume on the night of this first triumph; nor could there be on June 28, (when the moon was 20 days old,) before midnight at least.

iii. All these triumphs, and the games, diversions, and shows of various kinds which made part of the same celebrities, would thus be going on in the hottest part of the year; between June 28 and July 22: and that such was the case might be inferred even from the allusion in Dio[g] to the Παραπετάσματα, awnings or canopies, provided for the occasion; which could have been wanted for no purpose but that of screening the spectators from the sun. But it is most clearly implied in what Nicolaus of Damascus in his Life of Augustus tells us of the part assigned to him in particular in the same ceremonies[h]: Ἐκ τούτου τὰς θριαμβικὰς ἤγε πομπὰς Καῖσαρ, τοῦ κατὰ Λιβύην πολέμου τῶν τε ἄλλων οὓς ἐπολέμησε. καὶ τὸν νέον Καίσαρα υἱὸν ἤδη πεποιημένος, ὄντα δὲ τρόπον τινὰ καὶ φύσει (υἱὸν) διὰ τὸ ἀγχοτάτω τοῦ γένους εἶναι, ἐκέλευσε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἅρματι ἕπεσθαι. And again[i]: Βουλόμενος δ' αὐτὸν ὁ Καῖσαρ καὶ ἔμπειρον τοῦ ἀγωνοθετεῖν ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις χορηγίαις εἶναι, δύοιν ὄντοιν θεάτροιν, τοῦ μὲν Ῥωμαϊκοῦ ἐν ᾧ αὐτὸς παρὼν τὴν φροντίδα εἶχε, θατέρου δὲ Ἑλληνικοῦ, τούτῳ ἐπέτρεψεν ἐκείνου τὴν ἀγωνοθεσίαν. καὶ ὁ μὲν, σπουδάζων ἐπιμέλειάν τε καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἀποδείξασθαι ἐν καυματώδεσι καὶ μακροτάταις

[e] xliii. 22.
[f] Vita, xxxvii. 3. Dio, xliii. 21.
[g] xliii. 24: cf. Pliny, H. N. xix. 6. 310.
[h] Vita, viii.
[i] Ibid. ix.

ἡμέραις, οὐδαμοῦ τε ἀπῶν ἄχρι λύσειε τὴν θέαν, εἰς νόσον* πίπτει οἷα νέος καὶ πόνων ἀπείρατος. The days were therefore at their *longest* and consequently at their *hottest* also when these exhibitions were going on.

Lastly, it may be inferred from Dio[k] that all this must have been going on in the Roman September; because between the account of the close of these celebrities and that of the reformation of the calendar[l], (which properly began with the first intercalation *extra ordinem* at the end of the Roman November,) he interposes the mention of an human sacrifice, the reason of which he professes not to have known, but the fact he relates as follows: Ἄλλοι δὲ δύο ἄνδρες ἐν τρόπῳ τινὶ ἱερουργίας ἐσφάγησαν. καὶ τὸ μὲν αἴτιον οὐκ οἶδα εἰπεῖν..... ἐν δ' οὖν τῷ Ἀρείῳ πεδίῳ πρός τε τῶν πουτιφίκων καὶ πρὸς τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἄρεος ἐτύθησαν, καί γε αἱ κεφαλαὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ βασίλειον ἀνετέθησαν.

We suspect that it was a sacrifice to Jupiter Latiaris which was performed on this occasion. For though in the classical writers of antiquity, without exception, there is a total and mysterious silence concerning such a matter of fact as the immolation of human victims among the Romans of old, at a stated time, to Jupiter Latiaris in particular; the Christian Fathers, especially the earliest of them, assert it as an unquestionable matter of fact; as something which was still wont to be done in their time, and the doing of which they had seen with their own eyes[m]. It is probable however that only one such victim was usually sacrificed; but that on this occasion there were two: and that this was the reason why Dio noticed the sacrifice at all, as being so far something extraordinary. We should thus learn the stated month of this

* This illness and so contracted is recognized *obiter* by Suetonius, Augustus, viii. 3.

[k] xliii. 24.

[l] Ibid. 26.

[m] Justin Martyr, Apologia, ii. 128. 8–130. 3: cf. the Notes of Thirlby. Tatian, Oratio contra Gentes, xlvi. Theophilus ad Autolycum, iii. 6. 302–304. Tertullian, ii. 363. Contra Gnosticos, 7: v. 26 Apologeticus, 9. Lactantius, i. 21. Minucius Felix. xxi. 15: xxx. 4. Eusebius, Oratio De Laudibus Const. xiii. 646 D.

Compare with these Porphyry, De Abstinentia, ii. 56: Ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τίς ἀγνοεῖ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην πόλιν τῇ τοῦ Λατιαρίου Διὸς ἑορτῇ σφαζόμενον ἄνθρωπον; cf. Euseb. Præp. Evangelica, iv. 16.

sacrifice; viz. October: (in which too the October equus was annually sacrificed:) but not the day of the month*.

SECTION VII.—*On the administration of the seventh Cycle of the Irregular Calendar in general.*

And here we shall conclude our consideration of the Irregular Roman calendar: and with it the series of illustrations and proofs by means of which it has been explained and verified. The remainder of this year belongs to the history of the Julian correction.

Yet it would not be proper to take our leave of this subject without remarking on the singular contrast which the administration of this last cycle exhibits in comparison of that of every one before it but the very first; and in *this one* respect of the use or nonuse of the Merkedonius. There are only three intercalations discoverable in the whole of this cycle; one in the second year, one in the thirteenth, and one in the nineteenth. This last was no doubt intended in subserviency to the Julian correction. The first was introduced under the auspices of the pontiff who preceded Julius Cæsar; and the second, as we have already observed, was probably an accidental and unpremeditated consequence of the state of things at the time: and in particular of the death of Clodius.

* It appears from Festus[1], that Jupiter Latiaris was supposed to be Latinus, after his disappearance in battle with Mezentius. It seems too that his feriæ lasted six days[1]; during which both freemen and slaves wore a sort of oscilla or masks, for the reason assigned by Festus. What follows, in reference to Erigone[2] and to a similar custom among the Greeks, might imply that the proper time of these feriæ too was the end of the summer quarter, and the beginning of the autumnal.

The Feriæ Latinæ themselves are said to have been instituted in honour of Jupiter Latiaris[3]. The title given to these feriæ in the complex was the Latiar, Latiare sacrum: or the Latiaria made part of them[4]. Jupiter Latiaris was the presiding genius of the Mons Albanus[5]. And this title, as Suetonius tells us[6], was conferred on Caligula.

1 xiii. 315. 7. Oscillum.
2 Cf. Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, iii. xiv. 7. Hesychius in Αἴωρα: Ἀλήτις. Etym. Magn. Ἀλήτις. Servius, Ad Georg. i. 67: ii. 389. Hyginus, Fabb. cxxx: ccxxiv: Poet. Astron. ii. xxxv. Tzetzes, Chilias iv. 157–181. Hist. 128. Ampelius, Lib. Mem. cap. ii.
3 Dionys. Hal. iv. 49.
4 Dio, xlvii. 40.
5 Cicero, Oratio xxxviii, Pro Milone, 31, 85. Livy, xxi. 63.
6 Caius, xxii. 5.

This new rule of administration is strikingly opposed to that which is seen to have prevailed with great regularity in general from as far back as B. C. 153; and it is not the less remarkable because it begins to appear only from the time of the death of the pontiff Metellus, and of the election of Cæsar in his stead: both which things happened in the second year of the cycle. We cannot persuade ourselves that this coincidence was accidental and unintentional; nor yet, if it was otherwise, can we imagine any explanation of it so probable as *this*: viz. That Cæsar had conceived the design of reforming the calendar, on a certain principle, even before he was elected Pontifex Maximus this very year; and had already laid down a plan for that purpose in his own mind, which he intended to carry into effect as soon as he had the opportunity of doing so. From the account which Suetonius has given of the efforts which he made to ensure his election, it is clear that he attached no slight importance to its success; and that is accounted for, if he was projecting even at that time the correction of the calendar. For the first thing necessary, with that object in view, would be to get himself elected Pontifex Maximus.

Now it is agreed that Julius Cæsar came straight to Rome on this occasion, before his election to the office of Pontifex Maximus in U. C. 691 B. C. 63, from the court of Nicomedes king of Bithynia; where he had previously passed some time. The Bithynian calendar at this time was Julian in principle and Cyclical in appearance; that is, it was a calendar of that kind which united apparently both the Julian and the Cyclical principle; to which we have given the name of the Cyclico-Julian: and its epoch, (as we believe, and as possibly we may some time or other have an opportunity of shewing more at large,) was December 24 B. C. 170. The first period of this calendar (the Julian period of 120 years) would come to an end B. C. 50; and the head of the calendar at that time would be found to have fallen back to November 24: and the intercalation of a month of 30 days, just at the same time, according to rule in such cases, would be necessary to bring it back to its proper epoch of December 24. We strongly suspect that *this* was the kind of calendar which Julius Cæsar, when he returned from Bithy-

nia to Rome, was proposing to substitute for the Irregular Roman calendar, previously in use; a calendar which should be cyclical in appearance and Julian in reality like the Bithynian, and therefore be solar like that: but should consist of 365 days perpetually as that also did; and should be attached to the same epoch, December 24 and 23, as that: either of which terms at this period of time was competent to represent the winter solstice.

The first thing necessary, with such an object in view, would be to bring down the Kalends of the Roman January to November 24; and that having been effected, nothing would be necessary except to intercalate a month of 30 days, and so to bring them up to the desired epoch of December 24. In the year after Cæsar's election to the office of Pontifex Maximus, B. C. 62, they were falling on March 11; and that being the case it is manifest that they could not be brought down to November 24 except by a systematic abstinence from the use of the Merkedonius for a certain length of time. Accordingly from this time forward down to B. C. 54–53 no kind of years appears in the calendar, but the common one, either of 354 days or of 355 days; and it is not a little remarkable that, if the object of this mode of administering the calendar was really to bring down the Kalends of January to November 24, that effect was actually produced B. C. 53–52 itself: in which year, (answering to U. C. 702,) the Kalends of January are seen to have been falling on November 24 B. C. 53. The first Cyclico-Julian period of the Bithynian calendar would not expire until B.C. 50; but the epoch of their calendar had already begun to fall on November 24 in B. C. 53: which is a very observable coincidence, and does much to authorize the conclusion that the Roman kalends had been purposely brought down to this day, in order to agree with the Bithynian. It is evident at least that, if such a design as that of assimilating the Roman calendar to the Bithynian, and of regulating it thenceforward on the same Cyclico-Julian principle, had been actually conceived, no conjuncture could have been more favourable for its execution than this; when the Roman kalends were actually falling on the same day as the Bithynian, Nov. 24, and in the same year of the Cyclico-Julian

period, the 118th B. C. 53. Nothing would have been necessary just at this point of time except to intercalate a month of 30 days; and the thing desired would have been done. Nor is it improbable that the administrators of the calendar at Rome expected that this would have been done: and perhaps that expectation is the best explanation of the effect which, as we have seen, took place this year, and yet was not easy to be accounted for; viz. that of the Nundinal incidence on the Kalends of January U. C. 702: for that effect would not have taken place if a month had been intercalated at this time, and the Kalends of January had thereby been advanced from Nov. 24 to Dec. 24. Nov. 24 B. C. 53 was Nundinal, but Dec. 24 was not so. And perhaps had Cæsar himself been at Rome, and had the circumstances of the time been favourable, the calendar would have been corrected on *this* principle, and in *this* manner, and at *this* time. But he was absent in Gaul, and every thing at Rome was in confusion; and so the opportunity was lost. The ordinary Merkedonius of the Roman calendar, as we have seen, was intercalated this year, for the first time since B. C. 63; but with that exception the administration of the calendar went on in the same manner from B. C. 53–47, as from B. C. 63–53: i. e. admitting of no kind of year but the common one of this last cycle, that of 354 days. The consequence of which must necessarily be that the Kalends of January U. C. 708, the last year of the Irregular calendar, (the year of confusion as it is called,) would be found to have fallen back to October 11 B. C. 47. And yet when the work of correction was taken in hand in this year, it is very observable that the intercalary months, over and above the ordinary Merkedonius, which were intended to raise the Kalends of January to their proper epoch in the Julian correction, Dec. 30, were inserted at last between the months of November and December; that is, just where they must have been in the Cyclico-Julian correction of the Bithynian calendar.

It is the drift of these observations to render it probable that the kind of correction which Cæsar contemplated at first was the Cyclico-Julian; and that the actual administration of the calendar at Rome was made subservient to that object. Had this intention been carried into effect at last, it cannot

be denied that the Roman calendar by virtue of such a correction would have become *a* Julian one; but it is not less certain that it would not have been *the* Julian calendar. Whether Julius Cæsar himself under such circumstances had yet conceived a clear idea of such a calendar as the Julian properly so called, before he visited Egypt, we cannot undertake to say; but it is certain that, even if he had not, he must have acquired a clear idea of it *there*, he must have had the means at least of acquiring a clear and distinct idea of it there: of which we may take it for granted he would make good use. It was this visit of Cæsar's to Egypt then, and his residence in that country, after all, which determined the Julian correction. And in that point of view it must be regarded as providential. On this subject however we have said enough in our former work[n]. The birthplace of the Julian correction after all was not Italy but Egypt; and the model and prototype of the Julian calendar itself was the Sothiacal calendar of the Egyptians[o].

[n] Fasti Catholici, ii. 36 sqq.

[o] Cf. the Fasti Catholici, i. 551, Diss. vii. ch. ii. sect. 3: ii. 35–45, Diss. ix. ch. ii. sect. i. ii: iv. 171–261, Diss. xvii.

END OF VOL. III.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018